

A GENERAL REGULARITY THEORY FOR STABLE CODIMENSION 1 INTEGRAL VARIFOLDS

NESHAN WICKRAMASEKERA

ABSTRACT. We give a necessary and sufficient geometric structural condition, which we call the α -Structural Hypothesis, for a stable codimension 1 integral varifold on a smooth Riemannian manifold to correspond to an embedded smooth hypersurface away from a small set of generally unavoidable singularities. The α -Structural Hypothesis says that no point of the support of the varifold has a neighborhood in which the support is the union of 3 or more embedded $C^{1,\alpha}$ hypersurfaces-with-boundary meeting (only) along their common boundary. Whenever a stable integral n -varifold on a smooth $(n+1)$ -dimensional Riemannian manifold satisfies the α -Structural Hypothesis for some $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$, its singular set is empty if $n \leq 6$, discrete if $n = 7$ and has Hausdorff dimension $\leq n-7$ if $n \geq 8$; in view of well known examples, this is the best possible general dimension estimate on the singular set of a varifold satisfying our hypotheses. We also establish compactness of mass-bounded subsets of stable codimension 1 integral varifolds satisfying the α -Structural Hypothesis for some $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$. No initial smallness assumption on the singular set is necessary for these conclusions.

Our theory immediately implies the following: If the singular set of an n -dimensional stable minimal hypersurface with no removable singularities has vanishing $(n-1)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure, then the singular set is empty if $n \leq 6$, discrete if $n = 7$ and has Hausdorff dimension $\leq n-7$ if $n \geq 8$. This settles the long standing question, left open by the Schoen-Simon Regularity Theory [SS81], as to which weakest size hypothesis on the singular set of a stable minimal hypersurface guarantees the validity of the above conclusions.

An optimal strong maximum principle for stationary codimension 1 integral varifolds follows from these results.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
2. Notation	8
3. Statement of the main theorems	9
4. Proper blow-up classes	13
5. Lipschitz approximation and coarse blow-ups	20
6. Non-concentration of tilt-excess	22
7. An outline of the proof of the main theorems	25
8. Properties of coarse blow-ups: Part I	27
9. Properties of coarse blow-ups: Part II	31
10. Parametric L^2 -estimates in terms of fine excess	35
11. Blowing up by fine excess	48

Department of Pure Mathematics and Mathematical Statistics
University of Cambridge
Cambridge, CB3 0WB, United Kingdom.
N.Wickramasekera@dpmms.cam.ac.uk.

12. Continuity estimates for the fine blow-ups and their derivatives	51
13. Improvement of fine excess	61
14. Properties of coarse blow-ups: Part III	72
15. The Sheeting Theorem	79
16. The Minimum Distance Theorem	87
17. The Regularity and Compactness Theorem	100
18. Generalization to Riemannian manifolds	100
19. A varifold maximum principle	107
References	108

1. INTRODUCTION

Here we study regularity properties of stable critical points of the n -dimensional area functional in a smooth $(n+1)$ -dimensional Riemannian manifold, addressing, among a number of other things, the following basic question:

When is a stable critical point V of the n -dimensional area in a smooth $(n+1)$ -dimensional Riemannian manifold made-up of pairwise disjoint, smooth, embedded, connected hypersurfaces each of which is itself a critical point of area?

Without further hypothesis, V need not satisfy the stated property; this is illustrated by (a sufficiently small region of) any stationary union of three or more hypersurfaces-with-boundary meeting along a common $(n-1)$ -dimensional submanifold (e.g. a pair of transverse hyperplanes in a Euclidean space). In each of these examples, the connected components of the regular part of the union are not individually critical points of area (in the sense of having vanishing first variation with respect to area for deformations by compactly supported smooth vector fields of the ambient space; see precise definition below).

We give a fairly optimal answer to the above question by establishing a precise version (given as Corollary 1 below) of the following assertion:

Presence of a region of V where three or more hypersurfaces-with-boundary meet along their common boundary is the only obstruction for V to correspond to a locally finite union of pairwise disjoint, smooth, embedded, connected hypersurfaces each of which is itself a critical point of area.

This follows directly from our main theorem here (the Regularity and Compactness Theorem below) which establishes a precise version of the following regularity statement:

Presence of a region of V where three or more hypersurfaces-with-boundary meet along their common boundary is the only obstruction to complete regularity of V in low dimensions, and to regularity of V away from a small, quantifiable, set of generally unavoidable singularities in general dimensions.

In proving these results, we shall first work in the context where the ambient manifold is an open subset of $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ with the Euclidean metric. The differences that arise in the proof in replacing Euclidean ambient space by a general smooth $(n+1)$ -dimensional Riemannian manifold amount to “error terms” in various identities and inequalities that are valid in the Euclidean setting, and can

be handled in a straightforward manner. We shall discuss this further in the penultimate section of the paper.

Here, a *critical point of the n -dimensional area* means a stationary integral n -varifold; i.e. an integral n -varifold having zero first variation with respect to area under deformation by the flow generated by any smooth, compactly supported vector field of the ambient space. A stationary integral varifold V is *stable* if its regular part $\text{reg } V$ (the smooth, embedded part of V —see precise definition in Section 2) is stable in the sense that $\text{reg } V$ satisfies the *stability inequality*. In our codimension 1 setting, the stability inequality (for Euclidean ambient space) takes the useful form that

$$\int_{\text{reg } V} |A|^2 \zeta^2 d\mathcal{H}^n \leq \int_{\text{reg } V} |\nabla \zeta|^2 d\mathcal{H}^n \quad \forall \zeta \in C_c^\infty(\text{reg } V),$$

where A denotes the second fundamental form of $\text{reg } V$, $|A|$ the length of A , ∇ the gradient operator on $\text{reg } V$ and $\mathcal{H}^n$ the n -dimensional Hausdorff measure on $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$. Whenever $\text{reg } V$ is orientable, stability of a stationary integral varifold V is equivalent (see [Sim83], Section 9) to non-negativity of second variation of V with respect to area under deformation by the flow generated by any smooth vector field which is compactly supported away from the singular set $\text{sing } V$ (the part of V not in $\text{reg } V$ —see precise definition in Section 2) and which, on $\text{reg } V$, is normal to $\text{reg } V$. By a *stable integral n -varifold* we mean a stable, stationary integral n -varifold.

For $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and V a codimension 1 integral varifold on a smooth Riemannian manifold, we state the following condition which we shall refer to often throughout the rest of the introduction:

α -STRUCTURAL HYPOTHESIS. *No singular point of V has a neighborhood in which V corresponds to a union of embedded $C^{1,\alpha}$ hypersurfaces-with-boundary meeting (only) along their common boundary (and with multiplicity a constant positive integer on each of the constituent hypersurfaces-with-boundary).*

Our main theorem (Theorem 18.1; for Euclidean ambient space, Theorem 3.1) can now be stated as follows:

REGULARITY AND COMPACTNESS THEOREM. *A stable integral n -varifold V on a smooth $(n+1)$ -dimensional Riemannian manifold corresponds to an embedded hypersurface with no singularities when $1 \leq n \leq 6$; to one with at most a discrete set of singularities when $n = 7$; and to one with a closed set of singularities having Hausdorff dimension at most $n - 7$ when $n \geq 8$, (and with multiplicity, in each case, a constant positive integer on each connected component of the hypersurface), provided V satisfies the α -Structural Hypothesis above for some $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$.*

Furthermore, for any given $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$, each mass-bounded subset of the class of stable codimension 1 integral varifolds satisfying the α -Structural Hypothesis is compact in the topology of varifold convergence.

Once we know that the singular set is sufficiently small—in fact, as small as having vanishing $(n-1)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure—it is not difficult to check that the multiplicity 1 varifold associated with each connected component of the regular part of a stationary integral varifold is itself stationary. Thus we deduce from the Regularity and Compactness Theorem the following:

COROLLARY 1. *The α -Structural Hypothesis (see above) for some $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$ is necessary and sufficient for a stable codimension 1 integral varifold V on a smooth Riemannian manifold N to have the following “local decomposability property”:*

For each open $\Omega \subset N$ with compact closure in N , there exist a finite number of pairwise disjoint, smooth, embedded, connected hypersurfaces $M_1, M_2, \dots, M_k$ of Ω (possibly with a non-empty interior singular set $\text{sing } M_j = (\overline{M_j} \setminus M_j) \cap \Omega$ for each $j = 1, 2, \dots, k$) and positive integers $q_1, q_2, \dots, q_k$ such that the multiplicity 1 varifold $|M_j|$ defined by M_j is stationary in Ω for each $j = 1, 2, \dots, k$ and $V \llcorner \Omega = \sum_{j=1}^k q_j |M_j|$.

In 1981, R. Schoen and L. Simon ([SS81]) proved that the conclusions of the Regularity and Compactness Theorem hold for the n -dimensional stable minimal hypersurfaces (viz. embedded hypersurfaces which are stationary and stable as multiplicity 1 varifolds) satisfying, in place of the α -Structural Hypothesis, the property that the singular sets have locally finite $(n-2)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure. Since then, it has remained an open question as to what the *weakest* size hypothesis (in terms of Hausdorff measure) on the singular sets is that would guarantee the validity of the same conclusions. Since vanishing of the $(n-1)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure of the singular sets trivially implies the α -Structural Hypothesis, we have the following immediate corollary of the Regularity and Compactness Theorem, which settles this question:

COROLLARY 2. *The conclusions of the Regularity and Compactness Theorem hold for the n -dimensional stable minimal hypersurfaces with singular sets of vanishing $(n-1)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure. In fact, a stable codimension 1 integral n -varifold V satisfies the α -Structural Hypothesis for some $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$ if and only if its singular set has vanishing $(n-1)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure.*

A union of two transversely intersecting hyperplanes shows that for no $\gamma > 0$ can the singular set hypothesis in Corollary 2 be weakened to vanishing of the $(n-1+\gamma)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure.

In contrast to our α -Structural Hypothesis, the singular set hypothesis of [SS81], together with stability away from the singular set, *a priori* implies, by a straightforward argument, that the singularities are “removable for the stability inequality”—that is to say, the stability inequality is valid for the larger class of test functions ζ which are the restrictions to the hypersurface of compactly supported smooth functions of the ambient space (that are not required to vanish near the singular set). The techniques employed in [SS81] in the proof of the regularity theorems therein relied on this fact in an essential way. Interestingly, the α -Structural Hypothesis, or, for that matter, vanishing of the $(n-1)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure of the singular set, does not seem to imply *a priori* even local finiteness of total curvature, viz. $\int_{\text{reg } V \cap K} |A|^2 < \infty$ for each compact subset K of the ambient space (whereas the singular set hypothesis of [SS81] does, in view of the strengthening of the stability inequality just mentioned). This means that we cannot in our proof use the stability inequality in a direct way over arbitrary regions of the varifolds. (Of course *a posteriori* we can strengthen the stability inequality in the manner described above, so in particular it is true under our hypotheses that $\int_{\text{reg } V \cap K} |A|^2 < \infty$ for each compact subset K of the ambient space.) Our proof nevertheless at several stages makes indispensable use of the work of Schoen and Simon, specifically, Theorem 3.4 below; indeed, application of Theorem 3.4 in regions where we have sufficient control over the singular set is a principal way in which the stability hypothesis enters our proof.

The Regularity and Compactness Theorem is optimal in several ways. A key aspect of the theorem is that it *requires no hypothesis concerning the size of the singular sets*; nor does it require any hypothesis concerning the generally-difficult-to-control set of points where some tangent cone is a plane of multiplicity 2 or higher. What suffices is the easier-to-check α -Structural Hypothesis. As mentioned before, stationary unions of half-hyperplanes meeting along common axes, such as

pairs of transverse hyperplanes or a union of three half-hyperplanes meeting at 120° angles along a common axis, illustrate that a condition such as the α -Structural Hypothesis is needed.

For a general stationary integral varifold, a point where some tangent cone is a plane of multiplicity 2 or higher may or may not be a regular point. The “Sheeting Theorem” (Theorem 3.2 below) implies that if the varifold satisfies the hypotheses of the Regularity and Compactness Theorem, then such a point is a regular point. (As is well known, a point where there is a multiplicity 1 tangent plane is always a regular point, for any stationary integral varifold, by the regularity theorem of W. K. Allard ([All72], Section 8); also [Sim83], Theorem 23.1)). Indeed, the Sheeting Theorem is one of the two principal ingredients of the proof of the Regularity and Compactness Theorem; the other is the “Minimum Distance Theorem” (Theorem 3.3) which implies that no tangent cone to a varifold satisfying the hypotheses of the Regularity and Compactness Theorem can be supported by a union of three or more half-hyperplanes meeting along a common $(n - 1)$ -dimensional axis.

In view of well known examples of 7-dimensional stable hypercones with isolated singularities (e.g. the cone over $\mathbf{S}^3(1/\sqrt{2}) \times \mathbf{S}^3(1/\sqrt{2}) \subset \mathbf{R}^8$), the Regularity and Compactness Theorem is also optimal with regard to its conclusions in the sense that it gives, in dimensions ≥ 7 , the optimal general estimate on the Hausdorff dimension of the singular sets.

It remains an open question as to what one can say about the size of the singular sets if the stability hypothesis in the theorem is removed. Obviously one cannot in this case make the same conclusions in view of the fact that there are embedded non-equatorial minimal surfaces of $\mathbf{S}^3$ (e.g. $\mathbf{S}^1(1/\sqrt{2}) \times \mathbf{S}^1(1/\sqrt{2}) \subset \mathbf{S}^3$), the cones over which provide examples of stationary (unstable) hypercones in $\mathbf{R}^4$ with isolated singularities. There are no 2-dimensional singular stationary hypercones satisfying the α -Structural Hypothesis; it is however not known whether there is a singular 2-dimensional stationary integral varifold V in $\mathbf{R}^3$ such that V either satisfies the α -Structural Hypothesis or has a singular set of vanishing 1-dimensional Hausdorff measure or has an isolated singularity. It also remains largely open what one can say concerning stable integral varifolds of codimension > 1 . Again, the same conclusions as in our theorem cannot be made in this case due to the presence of branch point singularities, as illustrated by 2-dimensional holomorphic varieties with isolated branch points. See the remark following the statement of the Regularity and Compactness Theorem in Section 3 (Theorem 3.1) for a further discussion on optimality of our results here.

A direct consequence of Allard’s regularity theorem is that the regular part of a stationary integral varifold is a non-empty—in fact a dense—subset of its support [All72], Section 8.1]. Thus, given stationarity of the varifold, our stability hypothesis, which concerns only the regular part of the varifold, is never vacuously true. However, an open, dense subset could have arbitrarily small (positive) measure, and in fact, as mentioned above, under the stationarity hypothesis alone no general result whatsoever is known concerning the Hausdorff measure of the singular sets. Closely related to this is the point made before that from the hypotheses of the Regularity and Compactness Theorem, not even local finiteness of total curvature seems to follow *a priori*. In light of these considerations which indicate that our hypotheses are rather mild, it is somewhat surprising that they imply the optimal regularity of the hypersurfaces.

We may summarise as follows all of the various regularity results discussed above:

THEOREM. *Let V be a stable integral n -varifold on a smooth $(n + 1)$ -dimensional Riemannian manifold N . The following statements are equivalent:*

- (a) *For some $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$, V satisfies the α -Structural Hypothesis, viz. no singular point of V has a neighborhood in which V corresponds to a union of $C^{1,\alpha}$ embedded hypersurfaces-with-boundary meeting (only) along their common boundary, with multiplicity a constant positive integer on each constituent hypersurface-with-boundary.*

- (b) $\text{sing } V = \emptyset$ if $1 \leq n \leq 6$, $\text{sing } V$ is discrete if $n = 7$ and $\mathcal{H}^{n-7+\gamma}(\text{sing } V) = 0$ for each $\gamma > 0$ if $n \geq 8$.
- (c) $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\text{sing } V) = 0$.
- (d) V has the local decomposability property (defined in Corollary 1 above), viz. for each open $\Omega \subset N$ with compact closure in N , there exist a finite number of pairwise disjoint, smooth, embedded, connected hypersurfaces $M_1, M_2, \dots, M_k$ of Ω (possibly with $(\overline{M_j} \setminus M_j) \cap \Omega$ non-empty for each $j = 1, 2, \dots, k$) and positive integers $q_1, q_2, \dots, q_k$ such that the multiplicity 1 varifold $|M_j|$ defined by M_j is stationary in Ω for each $j = 1, 2, \dots, k$ and $V \llcorner \Omega = \sum_{j=1}^k q_j |M_j|$.
- (e) No tangent cone of V corresponds to a union of three or more half-hyperplanes meeting along a common $(n-1)$ -dimensional subspace, with multiplicity a constant positive integer on each constituent half-hyperplane.
- (f) V satisfies the α -Structural Hypothesis for each $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$.

Finally, we mention another direct implication of the Regularity and Compactness Theorem, namely, the following optimal strong maximum principle (Theorem 19.1) for codimension 1 stationary integral varifolds:

VARIFOLD MAXIMUM PRINCIPLE. *Let N be a smooth $(n+1)$ -dimensional Riemannian manifold.*

- (a) *If V_1, V_2 are stationary integral n -varifolds on N such that $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\text{spt } \|V_1\| \cap \text{spt } \|V_2\|) = \emptyset$, then $\text{spt } \|V_1\| \cap \text{spt } \|V_2\| = \emptyset$.*
- (b) *Let Ω_1, Ω_2 be open subsets of N such that $\Omega_1 \subset \Omega_2$ and let $M_i = \partial \Omega_i$ for $i = 1, 2$. If for $i = 1, 2$, M_i is connected, $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\text{sing } M_i) = 0$ and $|M_i|$ is stationary in N , then either $M_1 = M_2$ or $M_1 \cap M_2 = \emptyset$. Here $\text{sing } M_i = M_i \setminus \text{reg } M_i$ where $\text{reg } M_i$ is the set of points $X \in M_i$ such that M_i is a smooth, embedded submanifold near X .*

See Section 2 for explanation of notation used here. T. Ilmanen ([Ilm96]) proved this theorem assuming the stronger conditions $\mathcal{H}^{n-2}(\text{spt } \|V_1\| \cap \text{spt } \|V_2\|) < \infty$ in (a) and $\mathcal{H}^{n-2}(\text{sing } M_i) < \infty$, $i = 1, 2$, in (b). The version above follows directly from the argument in [Ilm96], in view of the fact that we may use Corollary 2 above in places where the argument in [Ilm96] depended on the Schoen-Simon theory. This version is optimal in the sense that neither a larger intersection in (a) nor larger singular sets in (b) can generally be allowed.

We now give a brief description of the proof of the Regularity and Compactness Theorem:

Fix any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and let $\mathcal{S}_\alpha$ denote the family of stable integral n -varifolds of the open ball $B_2^{n+1}(0) \subset \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ satisfying the α -Structural Hypothesis. The proof of the Regularity and Compactness Theorem is based on establishing the fact that no tangent cone at a singular point of a varifold belonging to the varifold closure of $\mathcal{S}_\alpha$ can be supported by (a) a hyperplane or (b) a union of half-hyperplanes meeting along an $(n-1)$ -dimensional subspace.

The assertion in case (a) follows from our Sheeting Theorem (Theorem 3.2), which says the following:

Whenever a varifold in $\mathcal{S}_\alpha$ is weakly close to a given hyperplane $\mathbf{P}_0$ of constant positive integer multiplicity, it must break up in the interior into disjoint, embedded smooth graphs (“sheets”) of small curvature over $\mathbf{P}_0$.

The assertion in case (b) is a consequence of the Minimum Distance Theorem (Theorem 3.3), which says the following:

No varifold in $\mathcal{S}_\alpha$ can be weakly close to a given stationary integral hypercone $\mathbf{C}_0$ corresponding to a union of three or more half-hyperplanes meeting along an $(n-1)$ -dimensional subspace (with constant positive integer multiplicity on each half-hyperplane).

Our strategy is to prove both these theorems simultaneously by an inductive argument, inducting on the multiplicity q of $\mathbf{P}_0$ for the Sheeting Theorem and on the density $\Theta(\|\mathbf{C}_0\|, 0)$ ($= q$ or $q+1/2$) of $\mathbf{C}_0$ at the origin for the Minimum Distance Theorem, where q is an integer ≥ 1 .

The main general idea in the argument is the following: Let q be an integer ≥ 2 and assume by induction the validity of the Sheeting Theorem when $\mathbf{P}_0$ has multiplicity $\in \{1, \dots, q-1\}$ and of the Minimum Distance Theorem when $\Theta(\|\mathbf{C}_0\|, 0) \in \{3/2, \dots, q-1/2, q\}$. Then, in a region of a varifold in $\mathcal{S}_\alpha$ where no singular point has density $\geq q$, we may apply the induction hypotheses together with a theorem of J. Simons ([SJ68]; see also [Sim83], Appendix B) and the “generalized stratification of stationary integral varifolds” due to F. J. Almgren Jr. ([Alm83], Theorem 2.26 and Remark 2.28) to reduce the dimension of the singular set to a low value. This permits effective usage of the stability hypothesis, including applicability of the Schoen-Simon version ([SS81], Theorem 2; also Theorem 3.4 below) of the Sheeting Theorem, in such a region. On the other hand, in the presence of singularities of density $\geq q$ (and whenever the density ratio of the varifold at scale 1 is close to q), it is possible to make good use of the monotonicity formula; most notable among its consequences in the present context are versions (Theorem 10.1 and Corollary 10.2), for a varifold in $\mathcal{S}_\alpha$ with small “height excess” relative to a hyperplane and lower order height excess relative to certain cones, of L. Simon’s ([Sim93]) *a priori* L^2 -estimates, and an analogous, new, “non-concentration-of-tilt-excess” estimate (Theorem 6.1(b)) giving control of the amount of its “tilt-excess” relative to the hyperplane in regions where there is a high concentration of points of density $\geq q$.

Combining these techniques, we are able to fully analyse, under the induction hypotheses, the “coarse blow-ups,” namely, the compact class $\mathcal{B}_q \subset W_{\text{loc}}^{1,2}(B_1; \mathbf{R}^q) \cap L^2(B_1; \mathbf{R}^q)$ (B_1 = the open unit ball in $\mathbf{R}^n$) consisting of ordered q -tuples of functions produced by blowing up sequences of varifolds in $\mathcal{S}_\alpha$ converging weakly to a multiplicity q hyperplane. (See precise definition of $\mathcal{B}_q$ at the end of Section 5.) One of the key properties that need to be established for $\mathcal{B}_q$ is that it does not contain an element H whose graph is the union of q half-hyperplanes in one half-space of $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ and q half-hyperplanes in the complementary half-space, with all half-hyperplanes meeting along a common $(n-1)$ -dimensional subspace and at least two of them distinct on one side or the other. (This is a Minimum Distance Theorem for $\mathcal{B}_q$, analogous to the Minimum Distance Theorem for $\mathcal{S}_\alpha$.) Establishing this property takes considerable effort and occupies a significant part (Sections 9 through 14) of our work, and is achieved as follows:

First we rule out (in Section 9), by a first variation argument utilizing the non-concentration-of-tilt-excess estimate of Theorem 6.1(b), the possibility that there is such $H \in \mathcal{B}_q$ with its graph having all q half-hyperplanes on one side coinciding (but not on the other).

The second, more involved step is to rule out the existence of such an element in $\mathcal{B}_q$ (call it H') with its graph having at least two distinct half-hyperplanes on each side. To this end we assume, arguing by contradiction, that there is such $H' \in \mathcal{B}_q$ and use the induction hypotheses to implement a “fine blow-up” procedure (see definition at the end of Section 11), where certain sequences of varifolds in $\mathcal{S}_\alpha$ are blown-up by their height excess (the “fine excess”) relative to appropriate unions of half-hyperplanes (corresponding to “vertical” scalings of H' by the coarse excess of the varifolds giving rise to H'). We use first variation arguments (in particular, Simon’s L^2 -estimates and the non-concentration-of-tilt-excess estimate of Theorem 6.1(b)) and standard $C^{1,\beta}$ boundary regularity theory for harmonic functions to prove a uniform interior continuity estimate (Theorem 12.2) for the first derivatives of the fine blow-ups, and use it, via an excess improvement argument, to show that our assumption $H' \in \mathcal{B}_q$ must contradict one of the induction hypotheses, namely, that the Minimum Distance Theorem is valid when $\Theta(\|\mathbf{C}_0\|, 0) = q$. This enables us to conclude that the coarse blow-up class $\mathcal{B}_q$ has the asserted property, viz. that the only elements in $\mathcal{B}_q$ which are given

by linear functions on either of two complementary half-spaces are the ones given by q copies of a single linear function everywhere.

Equipped with this fact and a number of other key properties we establish for the coarse blow-ups (see items $(\mathcal{B}1)$ – $(\mathcal{B}7)$ of Section 4 for a complete list), we ultimately obtain (in Theorems 14.3 and 4.1), subject to the induction hypotheses, interior C^1 regularity of coarse blow-ups and consequently, that any coarse blow-up is an ordered set of q harmonic functions (a Sheeting Theorem for $\mathcal{B}_q$, analogous to the Sheeting Theorem for $\mathcal{S}_\alpha$); furthermore, we show that these harmonic functions all agree if infinitely many members of a sequence of varifolds giving rise to the blow-up contain, in the interior, points of density $\geq q$.

The preceding result is the key to completion of the induction step for the Sheeting Theorem. Together with the Schoen-Simon version of the Sheeting Theorem, it enables us to prove a DeGiorgi type lemma (Lemma 15.1), the iterative application of which leads us to the following conclusion: Let $\mathbf{P}_0$ be a hyperplane with multiplicity q , and suppose that V is a varifold in $\mathcal{S}_\alpha$ lying weakly close to $\mathbf{P}_0$ in a unit cylinder over $\mathbf{P}_0$. Let D be the region of $\mathbf{P}_0$ inside a cylinder slightly smaller than the unit cylinder. Then (i) there is a closed subset of D over each point of which the support of V consists of a single point; furthermore, at this point, V has a unique multiplicity q tangent hyperplane almost parallel to $\mathbf{P}_0$, and relative to this tangent hyperplane, the height excess of V satisfies a uniform decay estimate; and (ii) over the complementary open set, V corresponds to embedded graphs of q ordered, analytic functions of small gradient solving the minimal surface equation. Facts (i), (ii) and elliptic estimates imply, by an elementary general argument (Lemma 4.3), that the varifold corresponds to q ordered graphs over all of D and that each graph satisfies a uniform $C^{1,\beta}$ estimate (Theorem 15.2) for some fixed $\beta \in (0, 1)$, completing the induction step for the Sheeting Theorem.

The final step of the argument is to show that the Minimum Distance Theorem holds whenever $\Theta(\|\mathbf{C}_0\|, 0) \in \{q + 1/2, q + 1\}$. Since we may now assume the validity of the Sheeting Theorem for multiplicity up to and including q , we have all the necessary ingredients to establish (in Theorem 16.1) that given $\mathbf{C}_0$, if there is a varifold $V \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$ weakly close to $\mathbf{C}_0$, then it must in the interior consist of $C^{1,\alpha}$ hypersurfaces-with-boundary meeting along their common boundary, directly contradicting the α -Structural Hypothesis and proving the validity of the Minimum Distance Theorem, subject to the induction hypotheses, when $\Theta(\|\mathbf{C}_0\|, 0) \in \{q + 1/2, q + 1\}$; our argument also establishes the Minimum Distance Theorem when $\Theta(\|\mathbf{C}_0\|, 0) \in \{3/2, 2\}$, since in this case we have, in place of the induction hypotheses, Allard's Regularity Theorem which implies the Sheeting Theorem when $q = 1$.

This completes the outline of the proof.

2. NOTATION

The following notation will be used throughout the paper:

n is a fixed positive integer ≥ 2 , $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ denotes the $(n + 1)$ -dimensional Euclidean space and $(x^1, x^2, y^1, y^2, \dots, y^{n-1})$ denotes a general point in $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$. We shall identify $\mathbf{R}^n$ with the hyperplane $\{x^1 = 0\}$ of $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$, and $\mathbf{R}^{n-1}$ with the subspace $\{x^1 = x^2 = 0\}$.

For $Y \in \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ and $\rho > 0$, $B_\rho^{n+1}(Y) = \{X \in \mathbf{R}^{n+1} : |X - Y| < \rho\}$.

For $Y \in \mathbf{R}^n$ and $\rho > 0$, $B_\rho(Y) = \{X \in \mathbf{R}^n : |X - Y| < \rho\}$. We shall often abbreviate $B_\rho(0)$ as B_ρ .

For $Y \in \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ and $\rho > 0$, $\eta_{Y,\rho} : \mathbf{R}^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ is the map defined by $\eta_{Y,\rho}(X) = \rho^{-1}(X - Y)$ and η_ρ abbreviates $\eta_{0,\rho}$.

$\mathcal{H}^k$ denotes the k -dimensional Hausdorff measure in $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$, and $\omega_n = \mathcal{H}^n(B_1(0))$.

For $A, B \subset \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$, $\text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(A, B)$ denotes the Hausdorff distance between A and B .

For $X \in \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ and $A \subset \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$, $\text{dist}(X, A) = \inf_{Y \in A} |X - Y|$.

For $A \subset \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$, $\overline{A}$ denotes the closure of A .

G_n denotes the space of hyperplanes of $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$.

For an n -varifold V (as in [All72]; see also [[Sim83], Chapter 8]) on an open subset Ω of $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$, an open subset $\tilde{\Omega}$ of Ω , a Lipschitz mapping $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ and a countably n -rectifiable subset M of Ω , we use the following notation:

$V \llcorner \tilde{\Omega}$ abbreviates the restriction $V \llcorner (\tilde{\Omega} \times G_n)$ of V to $\tilde{\Omega} \times G_n$.

$\|V\|$ denotes the weight measure on Ω associated with V .

$\text{spt } \|V\|$ denotes the support of $\|V\|$.

$f_{\#} V$ denotes the image varifold under the mapping f .

$|M|$ denotes the multiplicity 1 varifold on Ω associated with M .

For $Z \in \text{spt } \|V\| \cap \Omega$, $\text{VarTan}(V, Z)$ denotes the set of tangent cones to V at Z .

$\text{reg } V$ denotes the (interior) regular part of $\text{spt } \|V\|$. Thus, $X \in \text{reg } V$ if and only if $X \in \text{spt } \|V\| \cap \Omega$ and there exists $\rho > 0$ such that $\overline{B_\rho^{n+1}(X)} \cap \text{spt } \|V\|$ is a smooth, compact, connected, embedded hypersurface-with-boundary, with its boundary contained in $\partial B_\rho^{n+1}(X)$.

$\text{sing } V$ denotes the interior singular set of $\text{spt } \|V\|$. Thus, $\text{sing } V = (\text{spt } \|V\| \setminus \text{reg } V) \cap \Omega$.

3. STATEMENT OF THE MAIN THEOREMS

The Class $\mathcal{S}_\alpha$: Fix any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Denote by $\mathcal{S}_\alpha$ the collection of all integral n -varifolds V of $B_2^{n+1}(0)$ with $0 \in \text{spt } \|V\|$, $\|V\|(B_2^{n+1}(0)) < \infty$ and satisfying the following conditions:

(S1) STATIONARITY: V is a stationary point of the n -dimensional area functional in $B_2^{n+1}(0)$. Thus (see [[Sim83], Section 39]),

$$(3.1) \quad \int_{B_2^{n+1}(0) \times G_n} \text{div}_S \psi(X) dV(X, S) = 0$$

for every vector field $\psi \in C_c^1(B_2^{n+1}(0); \mathbf{R}^{n+1})$.

(S2) STABILITY: $\text{reg } V$ satisfies the stability inequality:

$$(3.2) \quad \int_{\text{reg } V} |A|^2 \zeta^2 d\mathcal{H}^n \leq \int_{\text{reg } V} |\nabla \zeta|^2 d\mathcal{H}^n \quad \forall \zeta \in C_c^1(\text{reg } V),$$

where A denotes the second fundamental form of $\text{reg } V$, $|A|$ the length of A and ∇ denotes the gradient operator on $\text{reg } V$.

(S3) α -STRUCTURAL HYPOTHESIS: For each given $Z \in \text{sing } V$, there exists *no* $\rho > 0$ such that $\text{spt } \|V\| \cap B_\rho^{n+1}(Z)$ is equal to the union of a finite number of embedded $C^{1,\alpha}$ hypersurfaces-with-boundary of $B_\rho^{n+1}(Z)$, all having common boundary in $B_\rho^{n+1}(Z)$ containing Z and no two intersecting except along their common boundary.

Remarks: (1) By Allard's regularity theorem, $\text{reg } V$ is a non-empty—in fact an open, dense—subset of $\text{spt } \|V\|$ for any stationary integral varifold V ([All72], Section 8.1), so given hypothesis (S1), hypothesis (S2) is never vacuously true. Note however that an open, dense subset can have arbitrarily small positive measure. But by our main theorem (Theorem 3.1 below), we conclude that for $V \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$, $\text{sing } V$ must in fact be lower dimensional.

(2) Whenever V is stationary and $\text{reg } V$ is orientable, condition (S2) is equivalent to non-negativity of second variation of V with respect to area under deformation by the flow generated by any smooth vector field normal to $\text{reg } V$ at every point of $\text{reg } V$ and with support $\subset B_2^{n+1}(0) \setminus \text{sing } V$. (See [Sim83], Section 9 for a proof of this assertion.)

(3) The hypothesis $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\text{sing } V) = 0$ trivially implies (S3), so all of our theorems concerning the class $\mathcal{S}_\alpha$ in particular apply to the class of stable minimal hypersurfaces M of $B_2^{n+1}(0)$ (that is, smooth embedded hypersurfaces M of $B_2^{n+1}(0)$ with their associated multiplicity 1 varifolds $V = |M|$ satisfying (S1) and (S2)) with no removable singularities (thus, if $X \in \overline{M}$ and $\overline{M}$ is a smooth, embedded hypersurface near X , then $X \in M$) and

$$\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\text{sing } M) = 0,$$

where $\text{sing } M = (\overline{M} \setminus M) \cap B_2^{n+1}(0)$. In fact, by Theorem 3.1, these two classes are the same.

(4) Hypothesis (S3) will of course be satisfied if no tangent cone to V at a singular point is supported by a union of three or more distinct n -dimensional half-hyperplanes meeting along an $(n-1)$ -dimensional subspace. By Theorem 3.3 below, for stable codimension 1 integral varifolds, this condition on the tangent cones is in fact equivalent to hypothesis (S3).

Our main theorem concerning the varifolds in $\mathcal{S}_\alpha$ is the following:

Theorem 3.1 (REGULARITY AND COMPACTNESS THEOREM). *Let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Let $\{V_k\} \subset \mathcal{S}_\alpha$ be a sequence with*

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|V_k\|(B_2^{n+1}(0)) < \infty.$$

There exist a subsequence $\{k'\}$ of $\{k\}$ and a varifold $V \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$ with $\mathcal{H}^{n-7+\gamma}(\text{sing } V \cap B_2^{n+1}(0)) = 0$ for each $\gamma > 0$ if $n \geq 7$, $\text{sing } V \cap B_2^{n+1}(0)$ discrete if $n = 7$ and $\text{sing } V \cap B_2^{n+1}(0) = \emptyset$ if $2 \leq n \leq 6$ such that $V_{k'} \rightarrow V$ as varifolds of $B_2^{n+1}(0)$ and smoothly (i.e. in the C^m topology for every m) locally in $B_2^{n+1}(0) \setminus \text{sing } V$.

In particular, if $W \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$, then $\mathcal{H}^{n-7+\gamma}(\text{sing } W \cap B_2^{n+1}(0)) = 0$ for each $\gamma > 0$ if $n \geq 7$, $\text{sing } W \cap B_2^{n+1}(0)$ is discrete if $n = 7$ and $\text{sing } W \cap B_2^{n+1}(0) = \emptyset$ if $2 \leq n \leq 6$.

Our proof of this theorem will be based on the following two theorems:

Theorem 3.2 (SHEETING THEOREM). *Let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Corresponding to each $\Lambda \in [1, \infty)$ and $\theta \in (0, 1)$, there exists a number $\epsilon_0 = \epsilon_0(n, \Lambda, \alpha, \theta) \in (0, 1)$ such that if $V \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$, $(\omega_n 2^n)^{-1} \|V\|(B_2^{n+1}(0)) \leq \Lambda$ and $\text{dist}_\mathcal{H}(\text{spt } \|V\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1), \{0\} \times B_1) < \epsilon_0$ then*

$$V \llcorner (\mathbf{R} \times B_\theta) = \sum_{j=1}^q |\text{graph } u_j|$$

for some integer q , where $u_j \in C^{1,\beta}(B_\theta)$ for each $j = 1, 2, \dots, q$; $u_1 \leq u_2 \leq \dots \leq u_q$;

$$\sup_{B_\theta} (|u_j| + |Du_j|) + \sup_{X_1, X_2 \in B_\theta, X_1 \neq X_2} \frac{|Du_j(X_1) - Du_j(X_2)|}{|X_1 - X_2|^\beta} \leq C \left(\int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} |x^1|^2 d\|V\|(X) \right)^{1/2};$$

and u_j solves the minimal surface equation on B_θ . Here $C = C(n, \Lambda, \alpha, \theta) \in (0, \infty)$ and $\beta = \beta(n, \Lambda, \alpha, \theta) \in (0, 1)$.

Theorem 3.3 (MINIMUM DISTANCE THEOREM). *Let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Let $\delta \in (0, 1/2)$ and $\mathbf{C}_0$ be an n -dimensional stationary cone in $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ such that $\text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}_0\|$ is equal to a finite union of at least three distinct n -dimensional half-hyperplanes of $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ meeting along an $(n-1)$ -dimensional subspace. There exists $\epsilon = \epsilon(n, \alpha, \delta, \mathbf{C}_0) \in (0, 1)$ such that if $V \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$, $\Theta(\|V\|, 0) \geq \Theta(\|\mathbf{C}_0\|, 0)$ and $(\omega_n 2^n)^{-1} \|V\|(B_2^{n+1}(0)) \leq \Theta_{\mathbf{C}_0}(0) + \delta$, then*

$$\text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\text{spt } \|V\| \cap B_1^{n+1}(0), \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}_0\| \cap B_1^{n+1}(0)) \geq \epsilon.$$

The proofs of Theorems 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 will be given in Sections 17, 15 and 16 respectively.

Remark: Theorems 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 are optimal in several ways:

(a) Examples such as pairs of transverse hyperplanes or a union of three half-hyperplanes meeting at 120° angles along a common axis show that Theorems 3.2, 3.3 and 3.1 do not hold if the structural hypothesis $(\mathcal{S}\beta)$ is removed (or replaced by the condition $\mathcal{H}^{n-1+\gamma}(\text{sing } V) = 0$ for any $\gamma > 0$). Stable *branched* minimal hypersurfaces (e.g. those constructed in [SW07] or in [Ros08]) show that there is no hope of proving regularity (as immersions) everywhere for stable codimension 1 integral varifolds, even when $n = 2$, without an assumption like $(\mathcal{S}\beta)$. Thus the structural condition $(\mathcal{S}\beta)$ can in particular be viewed as a geometric condition that rules out the existence of branch points in stable codimension 1 integral varifolds.

(b) Appropriate rescalings of a standard Catenoid show that Theorem 3.2 does not hold without the stability hypothesis $(\mathcal{S}\mathcal{L})$. Similarly, rescalings of Scherk's 2nd surface show that Theorem 3.3 does not hold without $(\mathcal{S}\mathcal{L})$. It is however an open question, even when $n = 2$, whether some form of Theorem 3.1 giving a bound on the singular set holds without $(\mathcal{S}\mathcal{L})$. In fact it remains open whether 2 dimensional stationary integral varifolds in $\mathbf{R}^3$ must be regular almost everywhere, even subject to a condition such as $(\mathcal{S}\beta)$.

(c) There are many examples provided by complex algebraic varieties demonstrating that Theorems 3.2 and 3.1 do not hold in codimension > 1 even if the stability hypothesis (which in higher codimension takes a different form from (3.2); see [Sim83], Section 9) is replaced by the (stronger) absolutely area minimizing hypothesis. For instance, the holomorphic varieties $V_t = \{(z, w) : z^2 = tw^3 + tw\} \cap B_1^4(0) \subset \mathbf{C} \times \mathbf{C} \equiv \mathbf{R}^4$, $t \in \mathbf{R}$, which are smooth, embedded area minimizing submanifolds lying close to the plane $z = 0$ for small $|t| \neq 0$, show that Theorem 3.2 does not hold in codimension > 1 . Those holomorphic varieties with branch point singularities such as $V = \{(z, w) : z^2 = w^3\} \cap B_1^4(0) \subset \mathbf{C} \times \mathbf{C}$ show that even in 2 dimension, C^2 regularity, and hence Theorem 3.1, is false if codimension > 1 . (For area minimizing currents of dimension n and arbitrary codimension, Almgren's theorem ([Alm83]) gives the optimal bound on the Hausdorff dimension of the interior singular sets, namely, $n - 2$.) Since the cone $\mathbf{C}_0$ in Theorem 3.3 is not area minimizing, there are no area minimizing examples nearby, but a given transverse pair of planes in $\mathbf{R}^3 \times \{0\} \subset \mathbf{R}^4$, for instance, can be perturbed in $\mathbf{R}^4$ into a union of two planes intersecting only at the origin, and the latter union is of course stable and satisfies $(\mathcal{S}\beta)$, showing that Theorem 3.3 is false in codimension > 1 .

Our theorems generalize the regularity and compactness theory of R. Schoen and L. Simon [SS81], which established Theorems 3.2 and 3.1 under the hypothesis $\mathcal{H}^{n-2}(\text{sing } V) < \infty$ in place of $(\mathcal{S}\beta)$.

(If we assume $\mathcal{H}^{n-2}(\text{sing } V) < \infty$, Theorem 3.3 is a straightforward consequence of Theorem 3.2 and inequality (3.2).) Our proofs of Theorems 3.2 and 3.3 however rely on the Schoen-Simon version of Theorem 3.2 in an essential way; in fact, what we need is the following slightly weaker version of their theorem:

Theorem 3.4 ([SS81], special case of Theorem 2). *Let V be a stationary integral varifold of $B_2^{n+1}(0)$ and assume in place of (S3) the (stronger) condition that $\mathcal{H}^{n-7+\gamma}(\text{sing } V) = 0$ for every $\gamma > 0$ in case $n \geq 7$ and $\text{sing } V = \emptyset$ in case $2 \leq n \leq 6$. Let all other hypotheses be as in Theorem 3.2. Then the conclusions of Theorem 3.2 hold.*

Remark: It suffices to prove Theorem 3.2 for $\theta = 1/8$ and arbitrary $\Lambda \in [1, \infty)$. To see this, suppose that case $\theta = 1/8$ of the theorem is true, with $\epsilon' = \epsilon'(n, \alpha, \Lambda) \in (0, 1)$ corresponding to ϵ_0 . Let $\theta \in (1/8, 1)$ and let the hypotheses be as in the theorem with $\epsilon_0 = \epsilon_0(n, \alpha, \Lambda, \theta) \in (0, 1)$ satisfying $\epsilon_0 < (\frac{1-\theta}{8}) \epsilon'(n, \alpha, 3^n \Lambda)$. We may then apply the case $\theta = 1/8$ of the theorem with $3^n \Lambda$ in place of Λ and with $\tilde{V} = \eta_{Z, (1-\theta)/2} V \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$ in place of V , where $Z \in \text{spt } \|V\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_\theta)$ is arbitrary; since we may cover $\text{spt } \|V\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_\theta)$ by a collection of balls $B_{(1-\theta)/2}^{n+1}(Z_j)$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, N$, with $Z_j \in \text{spt } \|V\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_\theta)$ and $N = N(n, \Lambda, \theta)$, the required estimate follows.

So assume $\theta = 1/8$ and let the hypotheses be as in Theorem 3.2. It follows from Allard's integral varifold compactness theorem ([All72], Theorem 6.4) and the Constancy Theorem for stationary integral varifolds ([Sim83], Theorem 41.1) that if $\epsilon_0 = \epsilon_0(n, \Lambda) \in (0, 1)$ is sufficiently small, then $q - 1/2 \leq (\omega_n R^n)^{-1} \|V\|(\mathbf{R} \times B_R) < q + 1/2$ for some integer $q \in [1, \Lambda + 1)$ and $R \in \{1/3, 2/3\}$. Then $V_1 \equiv \eta_{0, 1/3} V$ satisfies $(\omega_n 2^n)^{-1} \|V_1\|(B_2^{n+1}(0)) < q + 1/2$ and $q - 1/2 \leq \omega_n^{-1} \|V_1\|(\mathbf{R} \times B_1) < q + 1/2$. Thus in order to prove the special case $\theta = 1/8$ of Theorem 3.2 (and therefore the general version), it suffices to establish the following:

Theorem 3.2' (SHEETING THEOREM). *Let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Let q be any integer ≥ 1 . There exists a number $\epsilon_0 = \epsilon_0(n, \alpha, q) \in (0, 1)$ such that if $V \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$, $(\omega_n 2^n)^{-1} \|V\|(B_2^{n+1}(0)) < q + 1/2$, $q - 1/2 \leq \omega_n^{-1} \|V\|(\mathbf{R} \times B_1) < q + 1/2$ and $\text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\text{spt } \|V\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1), \{0\} \times B_1) < \epsilon_0$ then*

$$V \llcorner (\mathbf{R} \times B_{3/8}) = \sum_{j=1}^q |\text{graph } u_j|$$

where $u_j \in C^{1, \beta}(B_{3/8})$ for each $j = 1, 2, \dots, q$; $u_1 \leq u_2 \leq \dots \leq u_q$;

$$\sup_{B_{3/8}} (|u_j| + |Du_j|) + \sup_{X_1, X_2 \in B_{3/8}, X_1 \neq X_2} \frac{|Du_j(X_1) - Du_j(X_2)|}{|X_1 - X_2|^\beta} \leq C \left(\int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} |x^1|^2 d\|V\|(X) \right)^{1/2};$$

and u_j solves the minimal surface equation on $B_{3/8}$. Here $C = C(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty)$ and $\beta = \beta(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, 1)$.

Finally, we note that in the absence of the α -Structural Hypothesis (S3), Theorems 3.2, 3.3 and the upper semi-continuity of density of stationary integral varifolds give the following:

Corollary 3.5. *Let V be a stable integral n -varifold of $B_2^{n+1}(0)$ (in the sense that V satisfies (3.1) and (3.2)).*

If $Z \in \text{sing } V$ and one of the tangent cones to V at Z is (the varifold associated with) a hyperplane with multiplicity $q \in \{2, 3, \dots\}$, then for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, there exist a sequence of points $Z_j \in \text{sing } V$ with $Z_j \neq Z$, $Z_j \rightarrow Z$ and a sequence of numbers σ_j with $0 < \sigma_j < |Z_j - Z|$ such that for each $j = 1, 2, 3, \dots$, $\text{spt } \|V\| \cap B_{\sigma_j}^{n+1}(Z_j)$ is the union of at least 3 and at most $2q$ embedded $C^{1, \alpha}$ hypersurfaces-with-boundary meeting only along an $(n-1)$ -dimensional $C^{1, \alpha}$ submanifold of $B_{\sigma_j}^{n+1}(Z_j)$ containing Z_j .

In fact, if $Z \in \text{sing } V$ is such that one tangent cone $\mathbf{C}$ to V at Z has the form, after a rotation, $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{C}' \times \mathbf{R}^{n-k}$ for some $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, \min\{6, n\}\}$, then for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, there exist a sequence of points $Z_j \in \text{sing } V$ with $Z_j \neq Z$, $Z_j \rightarrow Z$ and a sequence of numbers σ_j with $0 < \sigma_j < |Z_j - Z|$ such that for each $j = 1, 2, 3, \dots$, $\text{spt } \|V\| \cap B_{\sigma_j}^{n+1}(Z_j)$ is the union of at least 3 and at most $2\Theta(\|V\|, Z)$ embedded $C^{1,\alpha}$ hypersurfaces-with-boundary meeting only along an $(n-1)$ -dimensional $C^{1,\alpha}$ submanifold of $B_{\sigma_j}^{n+1}(Z_j)$ containing Z_j .

4. PROPER BLOW-UP CLASSES

Fix an integer $q \geq 1$ and a constant $C \in (0, \infty)$. Consider a family $\mathcal{B}$ of functions $v = (v^1, v^2, \dots, v^q) : B_1 \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^q$ satisfying the following properties:

- (B1) $v \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,2}(B_1; \mathbf{R}^q) \cap L^2(B_1; \mathbf{R}^q)$.
- (B2) $v^1 \leq v^2 \leq \dots \leq v^q$.
- (B3) $\Delta v_a = 0$ in B_1 where $v_a = q^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^q v^j$.
- (B4) For each $z \in B_1$, either (B4 I) or (B4 II) below is true:
 - (B4 I) The *Hardt-Simon inequality*

$$\sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_{\rho/2}(z)} R_z^{2-n} \left(\frac{\partial ((v^j - v_a(z))/R_z)}{\partial R_z} \right)^2 \leq C \rho^{-n-2} \int_{B_\rho(z)} |v - \ell_{v,z}|^2$$

holds for each $\rho \in (0, \frac{3}{8}(1-|z|)]$, where $R_z(x) = |x-z|$, $\ell_{v,z}(x) = v_a(z) + Dv_a(z) \cdot (x-z)$ and $(v - \ell_{v,z}) = (v^1 - \ell_{v,z}^1, v^2 - \ell_{v,z}^2, \dots, v^q - \ell_{v,z}^q)$.

- (B4 II) There exists $\sigma = \sigma(z) \in (0, 1 - |z|]$ such that $\Delta v = 0$ in $B_\sigma(z)$.
- (B5) If $v \in \mathcal{B}$, then
 - (B5 I) $\tilde{v}_{z,\sigma}(\cdot) \equiv \|v(z + \sigma(\cdot))\|_{L^2(B_1(0))}^{-1} v(z + \sigma(\cdot)) \in \mathcal{B}$ for each $z \in B_1$ and $\sigma \in (0, \frac{3}{8}(1-|z|)]$ whenever $v \not\equiv 0$ in $B_\sigma(z)$;
 - (B5 II) $v \circ \gamma \in \mathcal{B}$ for each orthogonal rotation γ of $\mathbf{R}^n$ and
 - (B5 III) $\|v - \ell_v\|_{L^2(B_1(0))}^{-1} (v - \ell_v) \in \mathcal{B}$ whenever $v - \ell_v \not\equiv 0$ in B_1 , where $\ell_v(x) = v_a(0) + Dv_a(0) \cdot x$ for $x \in \mathbf{R}^n$ and we have used the notation $v - \ell_v = (v^1 - \ell_v^1, v^2 - \ell_v^2, \dots, v^q - \ell_v^q)$.
- (B6) If $\{v_k\}_{k=1}^\infty \subset \mathcal{B}$ then there exists a subsequence $\{k'\}$ of $\{k\}$ and a function $v \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $v_{k'} \rightarrow v$ locally in $L^2(B_1)$ and locally weakly in $W^{1,2}(B_1)$.
- (B7) If $v \in \mathcal{B}$ is such that for each $j = 1, 2, \dots, q$, there exist linear functions $L_1^j, L_2^j : \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ with $L_1^j(0, y) = L_2^j(0, y)$ for $y \in \mathbf{R}^{n-1}$, $v^j(x^2, y) = L_1^j(x^2, y)$ if $x^2 > 0$ and $v^j(x^2, y) = L_2^j(x^2, y)$ if $x^2 \leq 0$, then $v^1 = v^2 = \dots = v^q = L$ for some linear function $L : \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$.

We shall refer to any such class $\mathcal{B}$ as a *proper blow-up class*.

Our main result in this section (Theorem 4.1 below) is that *functions in any proper blow-up class are harmonic*. Subsequently, we shall prove that the collection of functions arising as “coarse blow-ups” (see Section 5 for the definition) of mass-bounded sequences of varifolds in $\mathcal{S}_\alpha$ converging weakly to a hyperplane is a proper blow-up class for a suitable constant C depending only on n and the mass bound.

Remark: The first use of the inequality in (B4 I) in the context of regularity theory for minimal submanifolds is due to R. Hardt and L. Simon ([HS79]).

Let $\mathcal{B}$ be a proper blow-up class. There exists a constant $\tau = \tau(\mathcal{B}) \in (0, 1/4)$ such that if $v \in \mathcal{B}$, $v_a(0) = 0$ and property $(\mathcal{B}_4 I)$ holds with $z = 0$, then

$$(4.1) \quad \int_{B_1 \setminus B_\tau} |v|^2 \geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{B_1} |v|^2.$$

To see this, note that since every weakly convergent sequence in $W^{1,2}(B_{2/3})$ is bounded, it follows from the compactness property $(\mathcal{B}_6)$ and property $(\mathcal{B}_5 I)$ that there exists a constant $C_1 = C_1(\mathcal{B}) \in (0, \infty)$ such that $\int_{B_{1/4}} |Dv|^2 \leq C_1 \int_{B_1} |v|^2$ for every $v \in \mathcal{B}$. Hence by property $(\mathcal{B}_4 I)$ with $z = 0$ and $\rho = 3/8$, we see that if $v_a(0) = 0$ then

$$\int_{B_{3/16}} \frac{|v|^2}{R^2} \leq 2(C + C_1) \int_{B_1} |v|^2.$$

This readily implies that for each $\tau \in (0, 3/16)$, $\int_{B_\tau} |v|^2 \leq 2(C + C_1)\tau^2 \int_{B_1} |v|^2$, and choosing $\tau = \tau(\mathcal{B}) \in (0, 3/16)$ such that $2(C + C_1)\tau^2 < 1/2$, we deduce (4.1).

Theorem 4.1. *If $\mathcal{B}$ is a proper blow-up class for some $C \in (0, \infty)$, then each $v \in \mathcal{B}$ is harmonic in B_1 . Furthermore, if $v \in \mathcal{B}$ and there is a point $z \in B_1$ such that $(\mathcal{B}_4 I)$ is satisfied, then $v^1 = v^2 = \dots = v^q$.*

The proof of this Theorem will be based on the following Proposition:

Proposition 4.2. *Let $\mathcal{B}$ be a proper blow-up class, and let $\tau = \tau(\mathcal{B}) \in (0, 1/4)$ be the constant as in (4.1). If $v \in \mathcal{B}$ satisfies property $(\mathcal{B}_4 I)$ with $z = 0$ and if v is homogeneous of degree 1 in the annulus $B_1 \setminus B_\tau$, viz. $\frac{\partial(v/R)}{\partial R} = 0$ a.e. in $B_1 \setminus B_\tau$, then $v^j = L$ in B_1 for some linear function L and all $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, q\}$.*

For the proofs of Theorem 4.1, Proposition 4.2 and subsequently, we shall need the following general principle:

Lemma 4.3. *Let $w \in L^2(B_1; \mathbf{R}^q)$. Suppose there is a closed subset $\Gamma \subset B_1$ and numbers $\beta, \beta_1, \beta_2 \in (0, \infty)$, $\mu \in (0, 1)$ and $\epsilon \in (0, 1/4)$ such that the following hold: For each $z \in \Gamma \cap B_{3/4}$, there is an affine function $\ell_z : \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^q$ with $\sup_{B_1} |\ell_z| \leq \beta$ such that*

$$\sigma^{-n-2} \int_{B_\sigma(z)} |w - \ell_z|^2 \leq \beta_1 \left(\frac{\sigma}{\rho} \right)^\mu \rho^{-n-2} \int_{B_\rho(z)} |w - \ell_z|^2$$

for all $0 < \sigma \leq \rho/2 \leq \epsilon/2$ and for each $z \in B_{3/4} \setminus \Gamma$, there is an affine function $\ell_z : \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^q$ such that

$$\sigma^{-n-2} \int_{B_\sigma(z)} |w - \ell_z|^2 \leq \beta_2 \left(\frac{\sigma}{\rho} \right)^\mu \rho^{-n-2} \int_{B_\rho(z)} |w - \ell_z|^2$$

for each affine function $\ell : \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^q$ and all $0 < \sigma \leq \rho/2 < \frac{1}{2} \text{dist}(z, \Gamma)$. Then $w \in C^{1,\lambda}(B_{1/2})$ for some $\lambda = \lambda(n, q, \beta_1, \beta_2, \epsilon, \mu) \in (0, 1)$ with

$$\sup_{B_{1/2}} (|w| + |Dw|) + \sup_{x,y \in B_{1/2}, x \neq y} \frac{|Dw(x) - Dw(y)|}{|x - y|^\lambda} \leq C \left(\beta^2 + \int_{B_1} |w|^2 \right)^{1/2}$$

where $C = C(n, q, \beta_1, \beta_2, \epsilon) \in (0, \infty)$.

Remark: In our applications of the lemma, the component functions of w , in $B_1 \setminus \Gamma$, will either be harmonic or smooth functions with small gradient solving the minimal surface equation; in either of these cases, the second estimate in the hypotheses of the lemma is standard with $\ell_z(x) = w(z) + Dw(z) \cdot (x - z)$ and β_2 depending only on n .

Proof. Consider an arbitrary point $y \in B_{3/4}$ and a number $\rho \in (0, \epsilon)$. With $\gamma = \gamma(n, \beta_1, \epsilon, \mu) \in (0, 1/8)$ to be chosen, if there is a point $z \in \Gamma \cap \overline{B_{\gamma\rho}(y)}$, then by the given condition with $\rho - |z - y|$ in place of ρ and $\sigma = \gamma\rho + |z - y|$,

$$\begin{aligned} (\gamma\rho)^{-n-2} \int_{B_{\gamma\rho}(y)} |w - \ell_z|^2 &\leq \left(1 + \frac{|z - y|}{\gamma\rho}\right)^{n+2} (\gamma\rho + |z - y|)^{-n-2} \int_{B_{\gamma\rho+|z-y|}(z)} |w - \ell_z|^2 \\ &\leq 2^{n+2} \beta_1 \left(\frac{\gamma\rho + |z - y|}{\rho - |z - y|}\right)^\mu (\rho - |z - y|)^{-n-2} \int_{B_{\rho-|z-y|}(z)} |w - \ell_z|^2 \\ &\leq 4^{n+2} \beta_1 \left(\frac{2\gamma}{1-\gamma}\right)^\mu \rho^{-n-2} \int_{B_\rho(y)} |w - \ell_z|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Choosing $\gamma = \gamma(n, \beta_1, \epsilon, \mu) \in (0, \epsilon)$ such that $4^{n+2} \beta_1 \left(\frac{2\gamma}{1-\gamma}\right)^\mu < 1/4$, we see from this that

$$(\gamma\rho)^{-n-2} \int_{B_{\gamma\rho}(y)} |w - \ell_z|^2 \leq 4^{-1} \rho^{-n-2} \int_{B_\rho(y)} |w - \ell_z|^2$$

for any $y \in B_{3/4}$ and $\rho \in (0, \epsilon)$ provided there is a point $z \in \Gamma \cap \overline{B_{\gamma\rho}(y)}$. In particular, if $z^* \in \Gamma$ is such that $|y - z^*| = \text{dist}(y, \Gamma)$, then

$$(4.2) \quad (\gamma\rho)^{-n-2} \int_{B_{\gamma\rho}(y)} |w - \ell_{z^*}|^2 \leq 4^{-1} \rho^{-n-2} \int_{B_\rho(y)} |w - \ell_{z^*}|^2$$

for each $\rho \in (0, \epsilon)$ such that $\gamma\rho \geq |y - z^*|$. If on the other hand $\Gamma \cap \overline{B_{\gamma\rho}(y)} = \emptyset$, then again by the given condition we know that for any affine function ℓ

$$(4.3) \quad (\sigma\gamma\rho)^{-n-2} \int_{B_{\sigma\gamma\rho}(y)} |w - \ell_y|^2 \leq \beta_2 \sigma^\mu (\gamma\rho)^{-n-2} \int_{B_{\gamma\rho}(y)} |w - \ell|^2$$

for all $\sigma \in (0, 1/2]$. Iterating inequality (4.2) with $\rho = \gamma^j$, $j = 1, 2, \dots$ and using inequality (4.3), we see that for each $y \in B_{3/4} \setminus \Gamma$, there is an integer $j^* \geq 1$, an affine function $\ell_\star (= \ell_{z^*})$ with $\sup_{B_1} |\ell_\star| \leq \beta$ and an affine function ℓ_y such that

$$(4.4) \quad (\sigma\gamma^{j^*+1})^{-n-2} \int_{B_{\sigma\gamma^{j^*+1}}(y)} |w - \ell_y|^2 \leq \beta_2 \sigma^\mu (\gamma^{j^*+1})^{-n-2} \int_{B_{\gamma^{j^*+1}}(y)} |w - \ell|^2$$

for each affine function ℓ and each $\sigma \in (0, 1/2]$; and

$$\begin{aligned} (\gamma^j)^{-n-2} \int_{B_{\gamma^j}(y)} |w - \ell_\star|^2 &\leq 4^{-1} (\gamma^{j-1})^{-n-2} \int_{B_{\gamma^{j-1}}(y)} |w - \ell_\star|^2 \\ (4.5) \quad &\leq 4^{-(j-1)} \gamma^{-n-2} \int_{B_\gamma(y)} |w - \ell_\star|^2 \quad \text{for each } j = 1, 2, \dots, j^*. \end{aligned}$$

By taking $\ell = \ell_\star$, $\sigma = 1/2$ in (4.4) and $j = j^*$ in (4.5), and using the triangle inequality, we see that

$$\left(\frac{1}{2}\gamma^{j^*+1}\right)^{-n-2} \int_{B_{\frac{1}{2}\gamma^{j^*+1}}(y)} |\ell_y - \ell_\star|^2 \leq C 4^{-(j^*-1)} \gamma^{-n-2} \int_{B_\gamma(y)} |w - \ell_\star|^2$$

which in particular implies

$$(4.6) \quad (\gamma^j)^{-n-2} \int_{B_{\gamma^j}(y)} |\ell_y - \ell_\star|^2 \leq C 4^{-j} \gamma^{-n-2} \int_{B_\gamma(y)} |w - \ell_\star|^2$$

for $j = 1, 2, \dots, j^*$, where $C = C(n) \in (0, \infty)$.

By (4.5) and (4.6), we conclude that

$$(4.7) \quad (\gamma^j)^{-n-2} \int_{B_{\gamma^j}(y)} |w - \ell_y|^2 \leq C 4^{-(j-1)} \gamma^{-n-2} \int_{B_\gamma(y)} |w - \ell_\star|^2$$

for each $j = 1, 2, \dots, j^\star$. Thus if $y \in B_{3/4} \setminus \Gamma$, we deduce that

$$(4.8) \quad \rho^{-n-2} \int_{B_\rho(y)} |w - \ell_y|^2 \leq C \rho^\lambda \gamma^{-n-2} \int_{B_\gamma(y)} |w - \ell_\star|^2$$

for all $\rho \in (0, \gamma]$, by considering, for any given $\rho \in (0, \gamma]$, the two alternatives: (i) $2\rho \leq \gamma^{j^\star+1}$, in which case $\rho = \sigma \gamma^{j^\star+1}$ for some $\sigma \in (0, 1/2]$ and we use (4.4) provided $\gamma = \gamma(n, q, \beta_1, \beta_2, \mu, \epsilon)$ is chosen to satisfy $\gamma^\mu < 1/4$ also, or (ii) $\gamma^{j+1} < 2\rho \leq \gamma^j$ for some $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, j^\star\}$, in which case we use (4.7).

In view of (4.8) (in case $y \in B_{3/4} \setminus \Gamma$) and the given condition (in case $y \in B_{3/4} \cap \Gamma$), we conclude that for each $y \in B_{3/4}$, there exists an affine function ℓ_y such that

$$(4.9) \quad \rho^{-n-2} \int_{B_\rho(y)} |w - \ell_y|^2 \leq C \rho^\lambda \left(\beta^2 + \int_{B_1} |w|^2 \right)$$

for all $\rho \in (0, \gamma]$, where $C = C(n, q, \beta_1, \beta_2, \mu, \epsilon) \in (0, \infty)$ and $\lambda = \lambda(n, q, \beta_1, \beta_2, \mu, \epsilon) \in (0, 1)$. It is standard that from this the assertions of the lemma follow. $\square$

In the proofs of Proposition 4.2, Theorem 4.1 and subsequently, we let, for $v \in \mathcal{B}$,

$$\Gamma_v = \{z \in B_1 \setminus \Omega_v : (\mathcal{B}4 I) \text{ holds}\}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_v &= \{z \in B_1 : \exists \rho \in (0, 1 - |z|] \text{ such that} \\ &\quad v^1(x) = v^2(x) = \dots = v^q(x) (= v_a(x)) \text{ for a.e. } x \in B_\rho(z)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Remark: Note that it follows directly from property $(\mathcal{B}4)$ that Γ_v is a relatively closed subset of B_1 and on $B_1 \setminus \Gamma_v$, v^j is a.e. equal to a harmonic function for each $j = 1, 2, \dots, q$.

Proof of Proposition 4.2. Let $\tau = \tau(\mathcal{B}) \in (0, 1/4)$ be as in (4.1). Note first that if $v \in \mathcal{B}$ is homogeneous of degree 1 in any annulus $B_1 \setminus B_{\tau'}$, $\tau' \in (0, 1)$, viz. v satisfies $\frac{\partial(v/R)}{\partial R} = 0$ a.e. in $B_1 \setminus B_{\tau'}$, then, since $v_a = q^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^q v^j$ is harmonic in B_1 by property $(\mathcal{B}3)$, it follows that v_a is a linear function in B_1 .

Let $\mathcal{H}$ denote the collection of all homogeneous of degree 1 functions $\tilde{v} : \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^q$ such that $\tilde{v}|_{B_1 \setminus B_\tau} \equiv v|_{B_1 \setminus B_\tau}$ for some $v \in \mathcal{B}$ satisfying property $(\mathcal{B}4 I)$ with $z = 0$. For any given $\tilde{v} \in \mathcal{H}$, let $T(\tilde{v}) = \{z \in \mathbf{R}^n : \tilde{v}(x+z) = \tilde{v}(x) \text{ for a.e. } x \in \mathbf{R}^n\}$. It is standard to verify using homogeneity of $\tilde{v}$ that $T(\tilde{v})$ is a linear subspace of $\mathbf{R}^n$.

For $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, n$, let $\mathcal{H}_k = \{\tilde{v} \in \mathcal{H} : \dim T(\tilde{v}) = n - k\}$ so that $\mathcal{H} = \cup_{k=0}^n \mathcal{H}_k$. Clearly $\mathcal{H}_0 = \{0\}$. Let $\tilde{v} \in \mathcal{H}_1$, and let v be any element $\in \mathcal{B}$ which is homogeneous of degree 1 in $B_1 \setminus B_\tau$ such that v satisfies property $(\mathcal{B}4 I)$ with $z = 0$ and v agrees with $\tilde{v}$ on $B_1 \setminus B_\tau$. We wish to show that there exists a linear function L such that $v^j = L$ in B_1 for each $j \in \{1, \dots, q\}$. This is true if $v^j = v_a$ on B_1 for each $j \in \{1, \dots, q\}$, so suppose $v - v_a \neq 0$ in B_1 and let $w = \|v - v_a\|^{-1}(v - v_a)$. Then $w \in \mathcal{B}$ by property $(\mathcal{B}5 III)$, $w \not\equiv 0$, $w_a \equiv 0$ and property $(\mathcal{B}4 I)$ is satisfied with w in place of v and $z = 0$, and hence by (4.1), $w \not\equiv 0$ in $B_1 \setminus B_\tau$. By the definition of $\mathcal{H}_1$ and property $(\mathcal{B}5 II)$ (of v), we may assume that $T(\tilde{v}) = \{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1}$, and by homogeneity of w in $B_1 \setminus B_\tau$, it then follows that there exist constants $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_q$, $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2 \leq \dots \leq \mu_q$, with $\sum_{j=1}^q \lambda_j = \sum_{j=1}^q \mu_j = 0$ such that, for each $j \in \{1, \dots, q\}$, $w^j(x^2, y) = \lambda_j x^2$ for each $(x^2, y) \in (B_1 \setminus B_\tau) \cap \{x^2 < 0\}$ and

$w^j(x^2, y) = \mu_j x^2$ for each $(x^2, y) \in (B_1 \setminus B_\tau) \cap \{x^2 > 0\}$. Moreover, since $w \not\equiv 0$ in $B_1 \setminus B_\tau$, we must have some $j_0 \in \{1, \dots, q-1\}$ such that either $\lambda_{j_0} > \lambda_{j_0+1}$ or $\mu_{j_0} < \mu_{j_0+1}$. Thus, taking any point $(0, y_1) \in (B_1 \setminus B_\tau) \cap (\{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1})$ and any number σ_1 with $0 < \sigma_1 < \min\{1 - |y_1|, |y_1| - \tau\}$ and setting $\tilde{w} = \|w((0, y_1) + \sigma_1(\cdot))\|_{L^2(B_1)}^{-1} w((0, y_1) + \sigma_1(\cdot))$, we produce an element $\tilde{w} \in \mathcal{B}$ whose existence contradicts the fact that $\mathcal{B}$ satisfies property $(\mathcal{B}\gamma)$. Hence it must be that $v - v_a = 0$ in B_1 , and $\mathcal{H}_1$ consists of linear functions.

Now let k_1 be the smallest integer $\in \{2, 3, \dots, n\}$ such that $\mathcal{H}_{k_1} \neq \emptyset$. Consider any $\tilde{v} \in \mathcal{H}_{k_1}$, and let v be any element $\in \mathcal{B}$ such that v satisfies property $(\mathcal{B}4I)$ with $z = 0$ and v agrees with $\tilde{v}$ on $B_1 \setminus B_\tau$. By property $(\mathcal{B}5II)$ (of v), we may assume that $T(\tilde{v}) = \{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-k_1}$. If $\Gamma_v \cap (B_1 \setminus B_\tau) \subseteq \{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-k_1}$, then by the remark immediately following the definition of Γ_v , v^j is harmonic in $(B_1 \setminus B_\tau) \setminus (\{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-k_1})$ for each $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, q\}$, whence by homogeneity, $\tilde{v}$ is harmonic on $B_1 \setminus (\{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-k_1})$. Since $\tilde{v}^j \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,2}(\mathbf{R}^n)$ and independent of the last $(n - k_1)$ variables, it follows that $\tilde{v}^j$ is harmonic in all of $\mathbf{R}^n$. By homogeneity of $\tilde{v}$ again and property $(\mathcal{B}2)$ of v , it follows that $\tilde{v}^1 = \tilde{v}^2 = \dots = \tilde{v}^q = L$ for some linear function L , contrary to the assumption that $\tilde{v} \in \mathcal{H}_{k_1}$ for $k_1 \geq 2$. So we must have that $\Gamma_v \cap (B_1 \setminus B_\tau) \setminus (\{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-k_1}) \neq \emptyset$. We shall contradict this also.

Let K be any compact subset of $(B_1 \setminus B_\tau) \setminus (\{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-k_1})$. We claim that there exists $\epsilon = \epsilon(v, K, \mathcal{B}) \in (0, 1)$ such that for each $z \in K \cap \Gamma_v$ and each ρ with $0 < \rho \leq \min\{\epsilon, \frac{1}{2}\text{dist}(K, \partial B_1 \cup \partial B_\tau)\}$,

$$(4.10) \quad \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_\rho(z) \setminus B_{\tau\rho}(z)} R_z^{2-n} \left(\frac{\partial((v^j - v_a)/R_z)}{\partial R_z} \right)^2 \geq \epsilon \rho^{-n-2} \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_\rho(z)} |v^j - v_a|^2.$$

(Recall that v_a is a linear function.) If this were false, then there would exist points $z, z_i \in K \cap \Gamma_v$, $i = 1, 2, 3, \dots$, with $z_i \rightarrow z$, and radii $\rho_i \rightarrow 0$ such that $v - v_a = (v^1 - v_a, \dots, v^q - v_a) \not\equiv 0$ in $B_{\rho_i}(z_i)$ for each $i = 1, 2, 3, \dots$ and

$$(4.11) \quad \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_{\rho_i}(z_i) \setminus B_{\tau\rho_i}(z_i)} R_{z_i}^{2-n} \left(\frac{\partial((v^j - v_a)/R_{z_i})}{\partial R_{z_i}} \right)^2 < \epsilon_i \rho_i^{-n-2} \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_{\rho_i}(z_i)} |v^j - v_a|^2$$

where $\epsilon_i \rightarrow 0^+$. The inequality (4.11) in particular implies that. By property $(\mathcal{B}5III)$, we have that $w \equiv \|v - v_a\|_{L^2(B_1)}^{-1} (v - v_a) \in \mathcal{B}$, so that, by property $(\mathcal{B}5I)$, $w_i \equiv w_{z_i, \rho_i} = \|w(z_i + \rho_i(\cdot))\|_{L^2(B_1)}^{-1} w(z_i + \rho_i(\cdot))$ also belongs to $\mathcal{B}$ for each sufficiently large i , and hence, by property $(\mathcal{B}6)$, there exists $w_\star \in \mathcal{B}$ such that after passing to a subsequence, $w_i \rightarrow w_\star$ locally in $L^2(B_1)$ and locally weakly in $W^{1,2}(B_1)$. Since $\|w_i\|_{L^2(B_1)} = 1$, it follows from (4.11) that $\|w_i\|_{L^2(B_{3/4})} > c$ for sufficiently large i , where $c = c(n) > 0$. Hence $w_\star \not\equiv 0$ in B_1 . By (4.11) again and the weak convergence $Dw_i \cdot (R^{-n-2}x) \rightarrow Dw_\star \cdot (R^{-n-2}x)$ in $L^2(B_{1-\epsilon} \setminus B_{\epsilon'})$, convergence $w_i \rightarrow w_\star$ in $L^2(B_{1-\epsilon})$ for any $\epsilon, \epsilon' \in (0, 1/4)$, it follows that $w_\star$ is homogeneous of degree 1 in $B_1 \setminus B_\tau$. Since property $(\mathcal{B}4I)$ is satisfied with w_i in place of v and with $z = 0$, it is also satisfied with $w_\star$ in place of v and with $z = 0$. Thus if $\tilde{w}_\star$ denotes the homogeneous of degree 1 extension of $w_\star|_{B_1 \setminus B_\tau}$ to all of $\mathbf{R}^n$, then $\tilde{w}_\star \in \mathcal{H}$. Note also that $\{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-k_1} \subseteq T(\tilde{w}_\star)$.

Now by homogeneity of v in $B_1 \setminus B_\tau$, we have that for each $y \in B_1$, sufficiently small $\sigma > 0$ and sufficiently large i ,

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma^{-n} \int_{B_\sigma(y)} w_i(x+z) dx &= \epsilon_i^{-1} \sigma^{-n} \int_{B_\sigma(y)} w(z_i + \rho_i(x+z)) dx \\ &= (1 + \rho_i) \epsilon_i^{-1} \sigma^{-n} \int_{B_\sigma(y)} w(z_i + (1 + \rho_i)^{-1} \rho_i(z - z_i) + (1 + \rho_i)^{-1} \rho_i x) dx \\ &= (1 + \rho_i)^{n+1} \epsilon_i^{-1} \sigma^{-n} \int_{B_{(1+\rho_i)^{-1}\sigma}((1+\rho_i)^{-1}(z-z_i+y))} w(z_i + \rho_i x) dx \\ &= (1 + \rho_i)^{n+1} \sigma^{-n} \int_{B_{(1+\rho_i)^{-1}\sigma}((1+\rho_i)^{-1}(z-z_i+y))} w_i(x) dx \end{aligned}$$

where $\epsilon_i = \|w(z_i + \rho_i(\cdot))\|_{L^2(B_1)}$, so first letting $i \rightarrow \infty$ in this (noting that $z_i \rightarrow z$) and then letting $\sigma \rightarrow 0$, we conclude that $\tilde{w}_*(y+z) = \tilde{w}_*(y)$ for a.e. y . i.e. $z \in T(\tilde{w}_*)$. But $z \in B_1 \setminus (\{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-k_1})$ (since $z \in K$), and therefore we must have $\dim T(\tilde{w}_*) > n - k_1$. Note on the other hand that by the definition of k_1 , either $k_1 = 2$ or (in case $k_1 \geq 3$) $\mathcal{H}_k = \emptyset$ for all $k = 2, \dots, (k_1 - 1)$, so that, in either case, whenever $\dim T(\tilde{v}) > n - k_1$ for some $\tilde{v} \in \mathcal{H}$, it follows that $\tilde{v} \in \mathcal{H}_1$. Thus we have shown that $\tilde{w}_* \in \mathcal{H}_1$ and hence that $\tilde{w}_*^1 = \tilde{w}_*^2 = \dots = \tilde{w}_*^q = L$ for some linear function L . But since $(w_i)_a \equiv 0$ for each $j = 1, 2, \dots$, it follows that $L = (\tilde{w}_*)_a = 0$, which is a contradiction. Thus (4.10) must hold for some $\epsilon = \epsilon(v, K, \mathcal{B})$ with $0 < \epsilon < \frac{1}{2} \text{dist}(K, \partial B_1 \cup \partial B_\rho)$ and all $z \in K$, $\rho \in (0, \epsilon]$ as claimed.

Combining (4.10) with property $(\mathcal{B}_4 I)$, we then have that

$$\sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_\rho(z) \setminus B_{\tau\rho}(z)} R_z^{2-n} \left(\frac{\partial((v^j - v_a)/R_z)}{\partial R_z} \right)^2 \geq \frac{\epsilon}{C} \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_{\tau\rho}(z)} R_z^{2-n} \left(\frac{\partial(v^j - v_a)/R_z}{\partial R_z} \right)^2$$

which implies that

$$(4.12) \quad \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_{\tau\rho}(z)} R_z^{2-n} \left(\frac{\partial((v^j - v_a)/R_z)}{\partial R_z} \right)^2 \leq \theta \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_\rho(z)} R_z^{2-n} \left(\frac{\partial(v^j - v_a)/R_z}{\partial R_z} \right)^2$$

for all $z \in K \cap \Gamma_v$ and $\rho \in (0, \epsilon]$, where $\theta = \theta(v, K, \mathcal{B}) \in (0, 1)$. Iterating this (for fixed $z \in K \cap \Gamma_v$) with $\tau^i \rho$, $i = 1, 2, 3, \dots$ in place of ρ , we see that

$$\sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_{\tau^i \rho}(z)} R_z^{2-n} \left(\frac{\partial((v^j - v_a)/R_z)}{\partial R_z} \right)^2 \leq \theta^i \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_\rho(z)} R_z^{2-n} \left(\frac{\partial(v^j - v_a)/R_z}{\partial R_z} \right)^2$$

for $i = 0, 1, 2, 3, \dots$, which readily implies that

$$\sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_\sigma(z)} R_z^{2-n} \left(\frac{\partial((v^j - v_a)/R_z)}{\partial R_z} \right)^2 \leq \beta \left(\frac{\sigma}{\rho} \right)^\mu \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_\rho(z)} R_z^{2-n} \left(\frac{\partial(v^j - v_a)/R_z}{\partial R_z} \right)^2$$

for any $z \in K \cap \Gamma_v$ and all $0 < \sigma \leq \rho/2 \leq \epsilon/2$, where the constants $\beta = \beta(v, K, \mathcal{B}) \in (0, \infty)$ and $\mu = \mu(v, K, \mathcal{B}) \in (0, 1)$ are independent of z . By property $(\mathcal{B}_4 I)$ and inequality (4.10), this yields the estimate

$$(4.13) \quad \sum_{j=1}^q \sigma^{-n-2} \int_{B_\sigma(z)} |v^j - v_a|^2 \leq 2^{-n-2} \epsilon^{-1} C \beta \left(\frac{\sigma}{\rho} \right)^\mu \rho^{-n-2} \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_\rho(z)} |v^j - v_a|^2$$

for each $z \in K \cap \Gamma_v$ and $0 < \sigma \leq \rho/2 \leq \epsilon/4$. Since property $(\mathcal{B}4II)$ and the definition of Γ_v imply that v is harmonic in $\mathbf{R}^n \setminus \Gamma_v$, we deduce from Lemma 4.3, the remark immediately following Lemma 4.3 and the arbitrariness of K that $v \in C^1((B_1 \setminus B_\tau) \setminus (\{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-k_1}))$.

Now by property $(\mathcal{B}4I)$, $\Gamma_v \cap (B_1 \setminus B_\tau) \setminus (\{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-k_1}) \subset$ the zero set of $u^j \equiv (v^j - v^{j-1})|_{B_1 \setminus B_\tau}$ for each $j = 2, \dots, q$. Since u^j is non-negative and C^1 in $(B_1 \setminus B_\tau) \setminus (\{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-k_1})$, it follows that $Du^j(z) = 0$ for any $z \in \Gamma_v \cap (B_1 \setminus B_\tau) \setminus (\{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-k_1})$. Also, by property $(\mathcal{B}4II)$ and the definition of Γ_v , u^j is harmonic in $(B_1 \setminus B_\tau) \setminus (\Gamma_v \cup (\{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-k_1}))$. In order to derive a contradiction, pick any point $z_1 \in \Gamma_v \cap (B_1 \setminus B_\tau) \setminus (\{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-k_1})$ and let $\rho_1 = \frac{1}{4} \text{dist}(z_1, \partial B_1 \cup \partial B_\tau \cup \{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-k_1})$. If $u^j(z) > 0$ for some $z \in B_{\rho_1}(z_1)$, then there exists $\rho \in (0, \rho_1)$ such that $u^j > 0$ in $B_\rho(z)$ and $\partial B_\rho(z) \cap (\Gamma_v \cap (B_1 \setminus B_\tau) \setminus (\{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-k_1})) \neq \emptyset$, contradicting the Hopf boundary point lemma. It follows that $u^j \equiv 0$ in $B_{\rho_1}(z_1)$ for each $j = 2, \dots, q$. But since $z_1 \in \Gamma_v$, this is impossible by the definition of Γ_v , so we see that the assumption $\Gamma_v \cap (B_1 \setminus B_\tau) \setminus (\{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-k_1}) \neq \emptyset$ leads to a contradiction. Thus $\mathcal{H}_k = \emptyset$ for each $k = 2, \dots, n$, and the Proposition is proved. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 4.1. The main point is, as in the proof of Proposition 4.2, to prove that $v \in C^1(B_1)$. For if this is true, then, by exactly the same argument as in the last paragraph of the proof of Proposition 4.2, we see that $\Gamma_v = \emptyset$, from which the first assertion of the theorem follows immediately.

In view of Lemma 4.3 and property $(\mathcal{B}4II)$, to prove that $v \in C^1(B_1)$, it suffices to establish that there are fixed constants $\beta = \beta(\mathcal{B}) \in (0, \infty)$ and $\mu = \mu(\mathcal{B}) \in (0, 1)$ such that for each $z \in \Gamma_v \cap B_{3/4}$ and $0 < \sigma \leq \rho/2 \leq 1/8$,

$$(4.14) \quad \sigma^{-n-2} \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_\sigma(z)} |v^j - \ell_z|^2 \leq \beta \left(\frac{\sigma}{\rho} \right)^\mu \rho^{-n-2} \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_\rho(z)} |v^j - \ell_z|^2$$

where ℓ_z is the affine function given by $\ell_z(x) = v_a(z) + Dv_a(z) \cdot (x - z)$, $x \in \mathbf{R}^n$. This estimate follows by exactly the same hole-filling argument used in the proof of Proposition 4.2. Specifically, we may first prove, by arguing by contradiction and using Proposition 4.2, that there exists a fixed constant $\epsilon = \epsilon(\mathcal{B}) > 0$ such that if $v \in \mathcal{B}$, $0 \in \Gamma_v$, $v_a(0) = 0$ and $Dv_a(0) = 0$, then

$$\sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_{1/4}(0) \setminus B_{\tau/4}(0)} R^{2-n} \left(\frac{\partial(v^j/R)}{\partial R} \right)^2 \geq \epsilon \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_{1/4}(0)} |v^j|^2$$

where $\tau = \tau(\mathcal{B}) \in (0, 1/4)$ is the constant as in (4.1). It follows from this and property $(\mathcal{B}4I)$ (by arguing as in the proof of (4.13)) that if $v \in \mathcal{B}$, $0 \in \Gamma_v$, $v_a(0) = 0$ and $Dv_a(0) = 0$, then

$$\rho^{-n-2} \int_{B_\rho(0)} |v|^2 \leq \beta \rho^\mu \int_{B_{1/2}} |v|^2 \quad \forall \rho \in (0, 1/2]$$

where $\beta = \beta(\mathcal{B}) \in (0, \infty)$ and $\mu = \mu(\mathcal{B}) \in (0, 1)$. In view of properties $(\mathcal{B}5I)$ and $(\mathcal{B}5III)$, the estimate (4.14) follows from this.

Since finiteness of $\sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_\rho(z)} R_z^{2-n} \left(\frac{\partial((v^j - v_a(z))/R_z)}{\partial R_z} \right)^2$ implies that $v^1(z) = v^2(z) = \dots = v^q(z)$ ($= v_a(z)$), the second assertion of the theorem follows from the first, property $(\mathcal{B}2)$ and the maximum principle. $\square$

5. LIPSCHITZ APPROXIMATION AND COARSE BLOW-UPS

We here recall (in Theorem 5.1 below) some facts concerning approximation of a stationary integral varifold weakly close to a hyperplane by the graph of a Lipschitz function over the hyperplane. These results were established by Almgren ([Alm83]), adapting, for higher multiplicity setting, the corresponding result of Allard ([All72]) for multiplicity 1 varifolds. We shall use these facts to blow up mass-bounded sequences of varifolds weakly converging to a hyperplane.

First note the following elementary fact, which we shall need here and subsequently: If V is a stationary varifold on $B_2^{n+1}(0)$, then

$$(5.1) \quad \int_{B_2^{n+1}(0)} |\nabla^V x^1|^2 \tilde{\zeta}^2 d\|V\|(X) \leq 4 \int_{B_2^{n+1}(0)} |x^1|^2 |\nabla^V \tilde{\zeta}|^2 d\|V\|(X)$$

for each $\tilde{\zeta} \in C_c^1(B_2^{n+1}(0))$. This is derived simply by taking $\psi(X) = x^1 \tilde{\zeta}^2(X) e^1$ in the first variation formula (3.1).

Let $\rho \in (0, 1)$ and suppose that $\text{spt } \|V\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_{(1+\rho)/2}) \subset \{|x^1| < 1\}$. Choosing $\tilde{\zeta}$ in (5.1) such that $\tilde{\zeta}(x^1, x') = \zeta(x')$ in a neighborhood of $\text{spt } \|V\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1)$, where $\zeta \in C_c^1(B_{(1+\rho)/2})$ is such that $\zeta \equiv 1$ on B_ρ , $0 \leq \zeta \leq 1$ and $|D\zeta| \leq C$ for some constant $C = C(\rho)$, we deduce from (5.1) that for each $\rho \in (0, 1)$,

$$(5.2) \quad \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_\rho} |\nabla^V x^1|^2 d\|V\|(X) \leq C \hat{E}_V^2$$

where $C = C(n, \rho) \in (0, \infty)$, and $\hat{E}_V = \sqrt{\int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} |x^1|^2 d\|V\|(X)}$.

Theorem 5.1 ([Alm83], Corollary 3.11). *Let q be a positive integer and $\sigma \in (0, 1)$. There exist numbers $\epsilon_0 = \epsilon_0(n, q, \sigma) \in (0, 1/2)$ and $\xi = \xi(n, q) \in (0, 1/2)$ such that the following holds: Let V be a stationary integral n -varifold on $B_2^{n+1}(0)$ with*

$$(\omega_n 2^n)^{-1} \|V\|(B_2^{n+1}(0)) < q + 1/2, \quad (q - 1/2) \leq \omega_n^{-1} \|V\|(\mathbf{R} \times B_1) < (q + 1/2) \text{ and}$$

$$\hat{E}_V^2 \equiv \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} |x^1|^2 d\|V\|(X) \leq \epsilon_0; \text{ let}$$

$$\Sigma = \pi \tilde{\Sigma}_1 \cup \pi \tilde{\Sigma}_2 \cup \pi \tilde{\Sigma}_3 \cup \Sigma'$$

where $\pi : \mathbf{R}^{n+1} \rightarrow \{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^n$ is the orthogonal projection,

$$\tilde{\Sigma}_1 = \left\{ Y \in \text{spt } \|V\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_\sigma) : \rho^{-n} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_\rho(\pi Y)} |\nabla^V x^1|^2 d\|V\|(X) \geq \xi \text{ for some } \rho \in (0, 1 - \sigma) \right\},$$

$$\tilde{\Sigma}_2 = \{Y \in \text{spt } \|V\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_\sigma) : \text{either } \text{Tan}(\text{spt } \|V\|, Y) \neq \text{Tan}^n(\|V\|, Y) \\ \text{or } \text{Tan}(\text{spt } \|V\|, Y) \notin G_n \text{ or } \Theta(\|V\|, Y) \text{ is not a positive integer}\},$$

$$\tilde{\Sigma}_3 = \left\{ Y \in \text{spt } \|V\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_\sigma) \setminus \tilde{\Sigma}_2 : 1 - (e_1 \cdot \nu(Y))^2 \geq 1/4 \right\}$$

where $\nu(Y)$ is the unit normal to $\text{Tan}(\text{spt } \|V\|, Y)$, and

$$\Sigma' = \left\{ Y \in B_\sigma \setminus (\pi \tilde{\Sigma}_1 \cup \pi \tilde{\Sigma}_2 \cup \pi \tilde{\Sigma}_3) : \Theta(\|\pi_\# V\|, Y) \leq q - 1 \right\}.$$

Then

$$(a) \quad \mathcal{H}^n(\Sigma) + \|V\|(\mathbf{R} \times \Sigma) \leq C \hat{E}_V^2 \text{ where } C = C(n, q, \sigma) \in (0, \infty).$$

- (b) *There are Lipschitz functions $u^j : B_\sigma \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, q$, with $u^1 \leq u^2 \leq \dots \leq u^q$ and $\text{Lip } u^j \leq 1/2$ for each $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, q\}$ such that for each $x \in B_\sigma \setminus \Sigma$,*

$$\text{spt } \|V\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times (B_\sigma \setminus \Sigma)) = \cup_{j=1}^q \text{graph } u^j \cap (\mathbf{R} \times (B_\sigma \setminus \Sigma)).$$

(In particular, for each $x \in B_\sigma \setminus \Sigma$, the set $\text{spt } \|V\| \cap \pi^{-1}(x)$ consists of at most q distinct points.)

- (c) *For each $x \in B_\sigma \setminus \Sigma$ and each $Y \in \text{spt } \|V\| \cap \pi^{-1}(x)$, $\Theta(\|V\|, Y)$ is a positive integer and*

$$\sum_{Y \in \text{spt } \|V\| \cap \pi^{-1}(x)} \Theta(\|V\|, Y) = q.$$

Proof. In view of the estimate (5.2), and the easily verifiable fact that in the present codimension 1 setting, the “unordered distance” is the same as the “ordered distance” (that is, if $a_j, b_j \in \mathbf{R}$ are such that $a_1 \leq a_2 \leq \dots \leq a_q$ and $b_1 \leq b_2 \leq \dots \leq b_q$, then $\mathcal{G}(\{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_q\}, \{b_1, b_2, \dots, b_q\}) \equiv \inf \left\{ \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^q (a_j - b_{\sigma(j)})^2} : \sigma \text{ is a permutation of } \{1, 2, \dots, q\} \right\} = \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^q (a_j - b_j)^2}$), the theorem follows immediately from [[Alm83], Corollary 3.11], which in turn is a fairly straightforward adaptation of the corresponding argument in [All72] for the case $q = 1$. $\square$

Let q be a positive integer. Let $\{V_k\}$ be a sequence of n -dimensional stationary integral varifolds of $B_2^{n+1}(0)$ such that

$$(5.3) \quad (\omega_n 2^n)^{-1} \|V_k\|(B_2^{n+1}(0)) < q + 1/2; \quad q - 1/2 \leq \omega_n^{-1} \|V_k\|(\mathbf{R} \times B_1) < q + 1/2$$

for each $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$, and $\hat{E}_k \rightarrow 0$, where

$$(5.4) \quad \hat{E}_k^2 \equiv \hat{E}_{V_k}^2 = \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} |x^1|^2 d\|V_k\|(X).$$

Let $\sigma \in (0, 1)$. By Theorem 5.1, for all sufficiently large k , there exist Lipschitz functions $u_k^j : B_\sigma \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, q$, with $u_k^1 \leq u_k^2 \leq \dots \leq u_k^q$ and

$$(5.5) \quad \text{Lip } u_k^j \leq 1/2 \quad \text{for each } j \in \{1, 2, \dots, q\}$$

such that

$$(5.6) \quad \text{spt } \|V_k\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times (B_\sigma \setminus \Sigma_k)) = \cup_{j=1}^q \text{graph } u_k^j \cap (\mathbf{R} \times (B_\sigma \setminus \Sigma_k))$$

where Σ_k is the measurable subset of B_σ that corresponds to Σ in Theorem 5.1 when V is replaced by V_k ; thus by Theorem 5.1,

$$(5.7) \quad \|V_k\|(\mathbf{R} \times \Sigma_k) + \mathcal{H}^n(\Sigma_k) \leq C \hat{E}_k^2$$

where $C = C(n, q, \sigma) \in (0, \infty)$. Set $v_k^j(x) = \hat{E}_k^{-1} u_k^j(x)$ for $x \in B_\sigma$, and write $v_k = (v_k^1, v_k^2, \dots, v_k^q)$. Then v_k is Lipschitz on B_σ ; and by (5.7) and (5.6),

$$(5.8) \quad \int_{B_\sigma} |v_k|^2 \leq C, \quad C = C(n, q, \sigma) \in (0, \infty).$$

Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_\sigma} (1 + |Du_k|^2)^{-1/2} |Du_k|^2 &= \int_{B_\sigma \setminus \Sigma_k} (1 + |Du_k|^2)^{-1/2} |Du_k|^2 \\ &\quad + \int_{B_\sigma \cap \Sigma_k} (1 + |Du_k|^2)^{-1/2} |Du_k|^2 \\ &\leq \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_\sigma} |\nabla^{V_k} x^1|^2 d\|V_k\|(X) + C_1 \hat{E}_k^2 \leq C_2 \hat{E}_k^2 \end{aligned}$$

where $C_1 = C_1(n, q, \sigma) \in (0, \infty)$, $C_2 = C_2(n, q, \sigma) \in (0, \infty)$ and we have used (5.5) in the first inequality and (5.2) in the second. By (5.5) again, this implies that

$$(5.9) \quad \int_{B_\sigma} |Dv_k|^2 \leq C, \quad C = C(n, q, \sigma) \in (0, \infty).$$

In view of the arbitrariness of $\sigma \in (0, 1)$, by (5.8), (5.9), Rellich's theorem and a diagonal sequence argument, we obtain a function $v \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,2}(B_1; \mathbf{R}^q) \cap L^2(B_1; \mathbf{R}^q)$ and a subsequence $\{k_j\}$ of $\{k\}$ such that $v_{k_j} \rightarrow v$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$ in $L^2(B_\sigma; \mathbf{R}^q)$ and weakly in $W^{1,2}(B_\sigma; \mathbf{R}^q)$ for every $\sigma \in (0, 1)$.

Definition: Let $v \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,2}(B_1; \mathbf{R}^q) \cap L^2(B_1; \mathbf{R}^q)$ correspond, in the manner described above, to (a subsequence of) a sequence $\{V_k\}$ of stationary integral n -varifolds of $B_2^{n+1}(0)$ satisfying (5.3) and with $\hat{E}_k \rightarrow 0$, where $\hat{E}_k$ is as in (5.4). We shall call v a *coarse blow-up* of the sequence $\{V_k\}$.

The Class $\mathcal{B}_q$: Denote by $\mathcal{B}_q$ the collection of all coarse blow-ups of sequences of varifolds $\{V_k\} \subset \mathcal{S}_\alpha$ satisfying (5.3) and for which $\hat{E}_k \rightarrow 0$, where $\hat{E}_k$ is as in (5.4).

We shall now begin, and end in Section 14, the central part of our work, namely, the proof that for any integer $q \geq 1$, $\mathcal{B}_q$ is a proper blow-up class (as defined in Section 4).

6. NON-CONCENTRATION OF TILT-EXCESS

The main result of this section is the estimates of Theorem 6.1(b), which says that for a stationary integral n -varifold of an open ball having small height excess relative to a hyperplane, concentration of points of “top density” near an $(n-1)$ -dimensional axis implies non-concentration, near the axis, of the tilt-excess relative to the hyperplane. This estimate will play a crucial role in the proof that $\mathcal{B}_q$ (see definition above) is a proper blow-up class—specifically, in establishing property $(\mathcal{B}7)$ (see Section 4) for $\mathcal{B}_q$. No stability hypothesis is required for the results of this section.

Theorem 6.1. *Let q be a positive integer, $\tau \in (0, 1/16)$ and $\mu \in (0, 1)$. There exists a number $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_1(n, q, \tau, \mu) \in (0, 1/2)$ such that if V is a stationary integral n -varifold of $B_2^{n+1}(0)$ with*

$$(\omega_n 2^n)^{-1} \|V\|(B_2^{n+1}(0)) < q + 1/2, \quad q - 1/2 \leq \omega_n^{-1} \|V\|(\mathbf{R} \times B_1) < q + 1/2 \quad \text{and}$$

$$\int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} |x^1|^2 d\|V\|(X) \leq \epsilon_1,$$

then the following hold:

- (a) For each point $Z = (z^1, z') \in \text{spt } \|V\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_{9/16})$ with $\Theta(\|V\|, Z) \geq q$,

$$|z^1|^2 \leq C \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} |x^1|^2 d\|V\|(X)$$

where $C = C(n, q) \in (0, \infty)$.

- (b) If L an $(n-1)$ -dimensional subspace of $\{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^n$ such that

$$L \cap B_{1/2} \subset (\{Z \in \text{spt } \|V\| : \Theta(\|V\|, Z) \geq q\})_\tau, \quad \text{then}$$

$$\int_{(L)_\tau \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_{1/2})} |\nabla^V x^1|^2 d\|V\|(X) \leq C \tau^{1-\mu} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} |x^1|^2 d\|V\|(X)$$

where $C = C(n, q, \mu) \in (0, \infty)$. In particular, C is independent of τ . Here for a subset A of $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$, we use the notation $(A)_\tau = \{X \in \mathbf{R}^{n+1} : \text{dist}(X, A) \leq \tau\}$.

Remarks: (1) Since Theorem 5.1 holds with tilt-excess $\int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} |\nabla^V x^1|^2 d\|V\|(X)$ in place of the height excess $\hat{E}_V^2$ (see [Alm83], Corollary 3.11), an examination of the proof below in fact shows that for any $\mu \in (0, 1)$, the more refined estimate

$$\int_{(L)_\tau \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_{1/2})} |\nabla^V x^1|^2 d\|V\|(X) \leq C \tau^{1-\mu} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} |\nabla^V x^1|^2 d\|V\|(X), \quad C = C(n, q, \mu) \in (0, \infty),$$

holds under the hypotheses of Theorem 6.1(b). We do not however need it here.

(2) A similar estimate for height excess relative to certain minimal cones was established in a “multiplicity 1 setting” in [Sim93]. Indeed, we shall later need a version of that as well (see Corollaries 10.3 and 16.4).

Proof. The proof is based on the monotonicity formula [[Sim83], 17.5], which implies that, for any $Z \in \text{spt } \|V\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_{9/16})$,

$$(6.1) \quad \int_{B_{3/8}^{n+1}(Z)} \frac{|(X - Z)^\perp|^2}{|X - Z|^{n+2}} d\|V\|(X) = \frac{\|V\|(B_{3/8}^{n+1}(Z))}{\omega_n(3/8)^n} - \Theta(\|V\|, Z).$$

Write $\hat{E}_V = \sqrt{\int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} |x^1|^2 d\|V\|(X)}$. Assuming $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_1(n, q) \in (0, \infty)$ is sufficiently small to guarantee the validity of its conclusions, Theorem 5.1 with $\sigma = 15/16$ implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \|V\|(B_{3/8}^{n+1}(Z)) &\leq \|V\|(\mathbf{R} \times B_{3/8}(z')) = \|V\|(\mathbf{R} \times (B_{3/8}(z') \setminus \Sigma)) + \|V\|(\mathbf{R} \times (B_{3/8}(z') \cap \Sigma)) \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_{3/8}(z') \setminus \Sigma} \sqrt{1 + |Du^j|^2} d\mathcal{H}^n + \|V\|(\mathbf{R} \times \Sigma) \leq \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_{3/8}(z')} \sqrt{1 + |Du^j|^2} d\mathcal{H}^n + C\hat{E}_V^2 \end{aligned}$$

where $C = C(n, q) \in (0, \infty)$, and u^j , $j = 1, 2, \dots, q$, Σ are as in Theorem 5.1; if, additionally, $\Theta(\|V\|, Z) \geq q$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\|V\|(B_{3/8}^{n+1}(Z))}{\omega_n(3/8)^n} - \Theta(\|V\|, Z) &\leq \frac{\|V\|(B_{3/8}^{n+1}(Z))}{\omega_n(3/8)^n} - q \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^q \frac{1}{\omega_n(3/8)^n} \int_{B_{3/8}(z')} \left(\sqrt{1 + |Du^j|^2} - 1 \right) d\mathcal{H}^n + C\hat{E}_V^2 \leq C \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_{3/8}(z')} |Du^j|^2 d\mathcal{H}^n + C\hat{E}_V^2 \\ &\leq C \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_{3/8}(z') \setminus \Sigma} |Du^j|^2 d\mathcal{H}^n + C \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_{3/8}(z') \cap \Sigma} |Du^j|^2 d\mathcal{H}^n + C\hat{E}_V^2 \\ (6.2) \quad &\leq C \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_{3/8}(z') \setminus \Sigma} |Du^j|^2 d\mathcal{H}^n + C\hat{E}_V^2 \leq C \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_{3/8}(z')} |\nabla^V x^1|^2 d\|V\|(X) + C\hat{E}_V^2 \leq C\hat{E}_V^2 \end{aligned}$$

where $C = C(n, q) \in (0, \infty)$, and in the last inequality we have used (5.2). Thus we deduce from (6.1) that

$$(6.3) \quad \int_{B_{3/8}^{n+1}(Z)} \frac{|(X - Z)^\perp|^2}{|X - Z|^{n+2}} d\|V\|(X) \leq C\hat{E}_V^2$$

for each $Z \in \text{spt } \|V\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_{9/16})$ with $\Theta(\|V\|, Z) \geq q$, where $C = C(n, q) \in (0, \infty)$.

To prove the assertion of part (a) of the Theorem, we estimate the left hand side of (6.1) from below as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{B_{1/4}^{n+1}(Z)} \frac{|(X-Z)^\perp|^2}{|X-Z|^{n+2}} d\|V\|(X) &\geq 4^{n+2} \int_{B_{1/4}^{n+1}(Z)} \left| \sum_{j=2}^{n+1} ((x^j - z^j)e_j^\perp + (x^1 - z^1)e_1^\perp) \right|^2 d\|V\|(X) \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2} 4^{n+2} \int_{B_{1/4}^{n+1}(Z)} |x^1 - z^1|^2 |e_1^\perp|^2 d\|V\|(X) - 4^n \int_{B_{1/4}^{n+1}(Z)} \sum_{j=2}^{n+1} |e_j^\perp|^2 d\|V\|(X) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} 4^{n+2} \int_{B_{1/4}^{n+1}(Z)} |x^1 - z^1|^2 |e_1^\perp|^2 d\|V\|(X) - 4^n \int_{B_{1/4}(Z)} |\nabla^V x^1|^2 d\|V\|(X) \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2} 4^{n+2} \int_{B_{1/4}^{n+1}(Z)} |x^1 - z^1|^2 |e_1^\perp|^2 d\|V\|(X) - C \hat{E}_V^2 \\
&\geq 4^{n+1} |z^1|^2 \int_{B_{1/4}^{n+1}(Z)} |e_1^\perp|^2 d\|V\|(X) - C \hat{E}_V^2 \\
(6.4) \quad &\geq 4^{n+1} |z^1|^2 \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_{1/8}(z') \setminus \Sigma} (1 + |Du^j|^2)^{-1} d\mathcal{H}^n - C \hat{E}_V^2 \geq C |z^1|^2 - C \hat{E}_V^2
\end{aligned}$$

where, for $\|V\|$ a.e. $X \in \text{spt } \|V\|$, $e_j^\perp(X)$ is the orthogonal projection of e_j onto the orthogonal complement of the approximate tangent plane $\text{Tan}(\|V\|, X)$ and $C = C(n, q) \in (0, \infty)$. Note that we have used the fact that $|Du^j| \leq 1/2$ a.e. and $\mathcal{H}^n(B_{1/8}(z') \setminus \Sigma) \geq \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{H}^n(B_{1/8}(z')) = \frac{1}{2} \omega_n (\frac{1}{8})^n$, which hold by Theorem 5.1 provided $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_1(n, q) \in (0, 1/2)$ is sufficiently small. The estimate of (a) readily follows from this and (6.3).

To see (b), let $Z = (z^1, z') \in \text{spt } \|V\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_{9/16})$ be an arbitrary point and choose $\zeta \in C_c^1(\mathbf{R}^{n+1})$ be such that $\zeta \equiv 1$ on $B_{3/8}^{n+1}(0)$, $\zeta \equiv 0$ in $\mathbf{R}^{n+1} \setminus B_{1/2}^{n+1}(0)$, $0 \leq \zeta \leq 1$ and $|D\zeta| \leq 16$ everywhere. Taking, for $\mu \in (0, 1)$, $\psi(X) = \zeta^2(X - Z) |X - Z|^{-n-2+\mu} |x^1 - z^1|^2 (X - Z)$ in the first variation formula (3.1) (a valid choice as shown by an easy cut-off function argument) and computing and estimating as in [Sim93], p. 616, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{B_{3/8}^{n+1}(Z)} \frac{|x^1 - z^1|^2}{|X - Z|^{n+2-\mu}} d\|V\|(X) \\
&\leq C \int \zeta^2(X - Z) \frac{|(X - Z)^\perp|^2}{|X - Z|^{n+2-\mu}} + \frac{|x^1 - z^1|^2}{|X - Z|^{n-\mu}} |\nabla^V \zeta(X - Z)|^2 d\|V\|(X)
\end{aligned}$$

where $C = C(n, \mu) \in (0, \infty)$. Since $\text{spt } D\zeta \subset B_{1/2}^{n+1}(0) \setminus B_{3/8}^{n+1}(0)$, this together with (6.3) and part (a) implies that

$$\int_{B_{3/8}^{n+1}(Z)} \frac{|x^1 - z^1|^2}{|X - Z|^{n+2-\mu}} d\|V\|(X) \leq C \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} |x^1|^2 d\|V\|(X)$$

for every $Z = (z^1, z') \in \text{spt } \|V\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_{9/16})$ with $\Theta(\|V\|, Z) \geq q$, where $C = C(n, q, \mu) \in (0, \infty)$; in particular,

$$\int_{B_{4\tau}^{n+1}(Z)} |x^1 - z^1|^2 d\|V\|(X) \leq C \tau^{n+2-\mu} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} |x^1|^2 d\|V\|(X)$$

for each $Z = (z^1, z') \in \text{spt } \|V\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_{9/16})$ with $\Theta(\|V\|, Z) \geq q$ and each $\tau \in (0, 1/16)$. In view of the hypothesis

$$L \cap B_{1/2} \subset (\{Z \in \text{spt } \|V\| : \Theta(\|V\|, Z) \geq q\})_\tau,$$

the preceding estimate implies that for each $Y \in L \cap B_{1/2}$, there exists $z^1 \in \mathbf{R}$ such that

$$\int_{B_{2\tau}^{n+1}(Y)} |x^1 - z^1|^2 d\|V\|(X) \leq C\tau^{n+2-\mu} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} |x^1|^2 d\|V\|(X).$$

This in turn implies by (5.1) that for each $Y \in L \cap B_{1/2}$,

$$\int_{B_{3\tau/2}^{n+1}(Y)} |\nabla^V x^1|^2 d\|V\|(X) \leq C\tau^{n-\mu} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} |x^1|^2 d\|V\|(X).$$

Since we may cover the set $(L)_\tau \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_{1/2})$ by N balls $B_{3\tau/2}^{n+1}(Y_j)$ with $Y_j \in L \cap B_{1/2}$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, N$ and with $N \leq C\tau^{1-n}$, $C = C(n)$, it follows that

$$\int_{(L)_\tau \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_{1/2})} |\nabla^V x^1|^2 d\|V\|(X) \leq C\tau^{1-\mu} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} |x^1|^2 d\|V\|(X)$$

with $C = C(n, q, \mu) \in (0, \infty)$, as required. $\square$

7. AN OUTLINE OF THE PROOF OF THE MAIN THEOREMS

Note that if $\mathbf{C}_0$ is a stationary cone as in Theorem 3.3, then $\Theta_{\mathbf{C}_0}(0) = q - 1/2$ or $\Theta_{\mathbf{C}_0}(0) = q$ for some integer $q \geq 2$. We prove both Theorem 3.2' and Theorem 3.3 simultaneously by induction on q . The case $q = 1$ of Theorem 3.2' is a consequence of Allard's regularity theorem. Validity of the cases $\Theta(\|\mathbf{C}_0\|, 0) = 3/2$ and $\Theta(\|\mathbf{C}_0\|, 0) = 2$ of Theorem 3.3 will be justified at the end of Section 16.

Let q be an integer ≥ 2 and consider the following:

INDUCTION HYPOTHESES:

- (H1) Theorem 3.2' holds with $1, \dots, (q-1)$ in place of q .
- (H2) Theorem 3.3 holds whenever $\Theta_{\mathbf{C}_0}(0) \in \{3/2, 2, 5/2, \dots, q\}$.

The inductive proof of Theorem 3.2' and Theorem 3.3 is obtained by completing, assuming (H1), (H2), the steps below in the order they are listed:

- STEP 1: Prove that $\mathcal{B}_q$ is a proper blow-up class. (Sections 8-14)
- STEP 2: Prove Theorem 3.2'. (Section 15)
- STEP 3: Prove Theorem 3.3 when $\Theta(\|\mathbf{C}_0\|, 0) = q + 1/2$. (Section 16)
- STEP 4: Prove Theorem 3.3 when $\Theta(\|\mathbf{C}_0\|, 0) = q + 1$. (Section 16)

Remarks: (1) Let $m \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and suppose that $\mathbf{C}$ is an m -dimensional stationary integral cone in $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$. Let $L_{\mathbf{C}} = \{Y \in \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}\| : \Theta(\|\mathbf{C}\|, Y) = \Theta(\|\mathbf{C}\|, 0)\}$. It is a well known consequence of the monotonicity formula that $L_{\mathbf{C}}$ is a linear subspace of $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ of dimension $\leq m$ and that $Y \in L_{\mathbf{C}}$ if and only if $T_Y \# \mathbf{C} = \mathbf{C}$, where $T_Y : \mathbf{R}^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ is the translation $T_Y(X) = X - Y$. Let $d_{\mathbf{C}} = \dim L_{\mathbf{C}}$. Then, if $\Gamma_{\mathbf{C}}$ is a rotation of $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ such that $\Gamma_{\mathbf{C}}(L_{\mathbf{C}}) = \{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{d_{\mathbf{C}}}$, we have that $\Gamma_{\mathbf{C}} \# \mathbf{C} = \mathbf{C}' \times \mathbf{R}^{d_{\mathbf{C}}}$, where $\mathbf{C}'$ is a stationary integral cone in $\mathbf{R}^{n+1-d_{\mathbf{C}}}$. Here, given an integer $d \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and a rectifiable varifold V' of $\mathbf{R}^{n+1-d}$, we use the notation $V' \times \mathbf{R}^d$ to denote the rectifiable varifold V of $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ with $\text{spt } \|V\| = \text{spt } \|V'\| \times \mathbf{R}^d$ and the multiplicity function θ_V defined by $\theta_V(x, y) = \theta_{V'}(x)$ for $(x, y) \in \text{spt } \|V'\| \times \mathbf{R}^d$, where $\theta_{V'}$ is the multiplicity function of V' .

(2) Let q be an integer ≥ 2 and suppose that the induction hypotheses (H1), (H2) hold. Let $V \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$. We claim the following:

- (a) If $2 \leq n \leq 6$, then $\text{sing } V \cap \{Z \in \text{spt } \|V\| : \Theta(\|V\|, Z) < q\} = \emptyset$.
- (b) If $n \geq 7$, $Z \in \text{sing } V$ and $\Theta(\|V\|, Z) < q$, then $d_{\mathbf{C}} \leq n - 7$ for any $\mathbf{C} \in \text{Var Tan}(V, Z)$.

To see this, suppose either (a) or (b) is false. Then we have either

- (a') for some $n \in \{2, 3, \dots, 6\}$, there exist a varifold $V \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$ and a point $Z \in \text{sing } V$ such that $\Theta(\|V\|, Z) < q$ or
- (b') for some $n \geq 7$, there exist a varifold $V \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$, a point $Z \in \text{sing } V$ with $\Theta(\|V\|, Z) < q$ such that $d_{\mathbf{C}} > n - 7$ for some $\mathbf{C} \in \text{Var Tan}(V, Z)$.

If (a') holds, fix any $\mathbf{C} \in \text{Var Tan}(V, Z)$.

In either case (a') or (b'), the induction hypothesis (H1) implies that $d_{\mathbf{C}} \neq n$; for if $d_{\mathbf{C}} = n$, then $\mathbf{C} = q'|P|$ for some integer $q' \in \{1, 2, \dots, q-1\}$ and some hyperplane P which we may take without loss of generality to be $\{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^n$, whence by the definition of tangent cone and the fact that weak convergence of stationary integral varifolds implies convergence of mass and convergence in Hausdorff distance of the supports of the associated weight measures, for any given $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\sigma \in (0, 1 - |Z|/2)$ such that $\text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\text{spt } \|\eta_{Z, \sigma} \# V\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1), \{0\} \times B_1) < \epsilon$, $q' - 1/2 \leq \omega_n^{-1} \|\eta_{Z, \sigma} \# V\|(\mathbf{R} \times B_1) < q' + 1/2$ and $(\omega_n 2^n)^{-1} \|\eta_{Z, \sigma} \# V\|(B_2^{n+1}(0)) < q' + 1/2$. Choosing $\epsilon = \epsilon_0(n, \alpha, q')$ where ϵ_0 is as in Theorem 3.2', by (H1), we may apply Theorem 3.2' to deduce that near Z , V corresponds to an embedded graph of a $C^{1, \alpha}$ function over P solving the minimal surface equation, and hence $\text{spt } \|V\|$ near Z is an embedded analytic hypersurface, contradicting our assumption that $Z \in \text{sing } V$. Thus $d_{\mathbf{C}} < n$.

Again in either case, the induction hypothesis (H2) implies that $d_{\mathbf{C}} \neq n - 1$; for if $d_{\mathbf{C}} = n - 1$, then $\text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}\|$ is the union of at least three half-hyperplanes meeting along an $(n - 1)$ -dimensional subspace, and since $\Theta(\|\mathbf{C}\|, 0) < q$, we must have that $\Theta(\|\mathbf{C}\|, 0) \in \{3/2, 2, 5/2, \dots, q - 1/2\}$. Again by the definition of tangent cone we have that for any given $\epsilon_1 > 0$, a number $\sigma \in (0, 1 - |Z|/2)$ such that $|(\omega_n 2^n)^{-1} \|\eta_{Z, \sigma} \# V\|(B_2^{n+1}(0)) - \Theta(\|\mathbf{C}\|, 0)| < 1/8$ and $\text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\text{spt } \|\eta_{Z, \sigma} \# V\| \cap B_1^{n+1}(0), \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}\| \cap B_1^{n+1}(0)) < \epsilon_1$, so choosing $\epsilon_1 = \frac{1}{2}\epsilon(\alpha, \frac{1}{8}, \mathbf{C})$ where ϵ is as in Theorem 3.3, we see by hypothesis (H2) we have a contradiction to Theorem 3.3.

Thus $d_{\mathbf{C}} \leq n - 2$. Assume now without loss of generality that $L_{\mathbf{C}} = \{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{d_{\mathbf{C}}}$. Then $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{C}' \times \mathbf{R}^{d_{\mathbf{C}}}$, where $\mathbf{C}'$ is an $(n - d_{\mathbf{C}})$ -dimensional stationary integral cone of $\mathbf{R}^{n+1-d_{\mathbf{C}}}$ with $0 \in \text{sing } \mathbf{C}'$. Note that since $\Theta(\|\mathbf{C}\|, Y) < q$ for each $Y \in \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}\|$, in view of hypothesis (H1), it follows from Theorem 3.2' that $\text{reg } \mathbf{C}$ satisfies the stability inequality; viz., $\int_{\text{reg } \mathbf{C}} |A_{\mathbf{C}}|^2 \zeta^2 \leq \int_{\text{reg } \mathbf{C}} |\nabla^{\mathbf{C}} \zeta|^2$ for each $\zeta \in C_c^1(\text{reg } \mathbf{C})$, where $A_{\mathbf{C}}$ denotes the second fundamental form of $\text{reg } \mathbf{C}$.

Now by a theorem of J. Simons [SJ68] (see [Sim83], Appendix B for a shorter proof), we know that if $2 \leq n \leq 6$, there does not exist, in $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$, a minimal hypercone with an isolated singularity and satisfying the stability inequality. Applying this to $\mathbf{C}'$, we conclude that if $\text{sing } \mathbf{C} = \{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{d_{\mathbf{C}}}$, then, in either of the cases (a') or (b'), we have a contradiction. Hence there is a point $Z_1 \in \text{sing } \mathbf{C} \setminus \{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{d_{\mathbf{C}}}$.

Let $\mathbf{C}_1 \in \text{Var Tan}(\mathbf{C}, Z_1)$. Then $\{tZ_1 : t \in \mathbf{R}\} \times \mathbf{R}^{d_{\mathbf{C}}} \subseteq L_{\mathbf{C}_1}$ so that $d_{\mathbf{C}_1} \geq d_{\mathbf{C}} + 1$. Since $\mathbf{C}_1 \llcorner B_1^{n+1}(0) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} V_k$ for some sequence of varifolds $\{V_k\} \subset \mathcal{S}_\alpha$ (indeed, $V_k = \eta_{\tilde{Z}_k, \sigma_k} \# V$ for some sequence of points $\tilde{Z}_k$ and a sequence of positive numbers σ_k converging to 0) and $\Theta(\|\mathbf{C}_1\|, 0) = \Theta(\|\mathbf{C}\|, Z_1) < q$, by reasoning as above, we see that $d_{\mathbf{C}_1} \leq n - 2$ and that $\text{reg } \mathbf{C}_1$ satisfies the stability inequality. Thus $d_{\mathbf{C}} \leq n - 3$, and hence in particular $n \geq 3$.

By Simons' theorem again, there exists a point $Z_2 \in \text{sing } \mathbf{C}_1 \setminus L_{\mathbf{C}_1}$, which implies (by reasoning as above considering a cone $\mathbf{C}_2 \in \text{Var Tan}(\mathbf{C}_1, Z_2)$) that $d_{\mathbf{C}} \leq n - 4$ and $n \geq 4$. Repeating this argument twice more in case (a'), we produce a cone contradicting Simons' theorem, and three times more in case (b'), we reach the conclusion $d_{\mathbf{C}} \leq n - 7$ contrary to the assumption. Thus both claims (a) and (b) must hold.

(3) By Remark (2) above and, in case $n \geq 7$, Almgren's generalized stratification of stationary integral varifolds ([Alm83], p. 224, Theorem 2.26 and Remark 2.28; see [Sim96], Section 3.4 for a concise presentation of the argument in the context of energy minimizing maps), we have the following:

Let q be an integer ≥ 2 . If the induction hypotheses (H1), (H2) hold, $V \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$, $\Omega \subseteq B_2^{n+1}(0)$ is open and $\Theta(\|V\|, Z) < q$ for each $Z \in \text{spt } \|V\| \cap \Omega$, then $\mathcal{H}^{n-7+\gamma}(\text{sing } V \llcorner \Omega) = 0$ for each $\gamma > 0$ if $n \geq 7$ and $\text{sing } V \llcorner \Omega = \emptyset$ if $2 \leq n \leq 6$.

8. PROPERTIES OF COARSE BLOW-UPS: PART I

Recall from Section 4 the defining properties (B1) – (B7) of a proper blow-up class $\mathcal{B}$, and note that it follows from the discussion in Section 5 that the class $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}_q$ satisfies properties (B1) and (B2). In this section, we verify that $\mathcal{B}_q$ also satisfies properties (B3) – (B6).

Let $v \in \mathcal{B}_q$ be arbitrary. By the definition of $\mathcal{B}_q$, there exists, for each $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$, a stationary integral varifold $V_k \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$ such that the following are true: $(\omega_n 2^n)^{-1} \|V_k\|(B_2^{n+1}(0)) < q + 1/2$; $q - 1/2 \leq \omega_n^{-1} \|V_k\|(\mathbf{R} \times B_1) < q + 1/2$; $\hat{E}_k^2 \equiv \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} |x^1|^2 d\|V_k\|(X) \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$; for each $\sigma \in (0, 1)$ and each sufficiently large k depending on σ , if $u_k^j : B_\sigma \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is the functions corresponding to u^j , $j = 1, 2, \dots, q$, and $\Sigma_k \subset B_\sigma$ is the measurable set corresponding to Σ in Theorem 5.1 taken with V_k in place of V , then, $u_k^1 \leq u_k^2 \leq \dots \leq u_k^q$; u_k^j is Lipschitz with

$$(8.1) \quad \text{Lip } u_k^j \leq 1/2 \quad \text{for each } j \in \{1, 2, \dots, q\};$$

$$\text{spt } \|V_k\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times (B_\sigma \setminus \Sigma_k)) = \cup_{j=1}^q \text{graph } u_k^j;$$

$$(8.2) \quad \|V_k\|(\mathbf{R} \times \Sigma_k) + \mathcal{H}^n(\Sigma_k) \leq C \hat{E}_k^2$$

where $C = (n, q, \sigma) \in (0, \infty)$; and $\hat{E}_k^{-1} u_k^j \rightarrow v^j$ for each $j = 1, 2, \dots, q$, where the convergence is in $L^2(B_\sigma)$ and weakly in $W^{1,2}(B_\sigma)$.

To verify that v satisfies property (B3), note that by (3.1), for each k and each function $\zeta \in C_c^1(B_\sigma)$, we have that

$$(8.3) \quad \int \nabla^{V_k} x^1 \cdot \nabla^{V_k} \tilde{\zeta} d\|V_k\|(X) = 0$$

where $\tilde{\zeta}$ is any function in $C_c^1(\mathbf{R} \times B_\sigma)$ such that $\tilde{\zeta} \equiv \zeta_1$ in a neighborhood of $\text{spt } \|V_k\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_\sigma)$, where $\zeta_1(X)$ is defined for $X = (x^1, x') \in \mathbf{R} \times B_\sigma$ by $\zeta_1(x^1, x') = \zeta(x')$. Since $x^1 = \tilde{u}_k^j(X)$ for $\|V_k\|$ a.e. $X = (x^1, x') \in \text{graph } u_k^j \cap \text{spt } \|V_k\|$, where $\tilde{u}_k^j(x', x^1) = u_k^j(x)$ for $(x^1, x') \in \mathbf{R} \times B_\sigma$, we deduce from (8.3) that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_\sigma} (1 + |Du_k^j|^2)^{-1/2} Du_k^j \cdot D\zeta &= - \int_{\mathbf{R} \times (B_\sigma \setminus \Sigma_k)} \nabla^{V_k} x^1 \cdot \nabla^{V_k} \tilde{\zeta} d\|V_k\|(X) \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_\sigma \cap \Sigma_k} (1 + |Du_k^j|^2)^{-1/2} Du_k^j \cdot D\zeta \end{aligned}$$

which can be rewritten as

$$(8.4) \quad \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_\sigma} Du_k^j \cdot D\zeta = - \int_{\mathbf{R} \times (B_\sigma \setminus \Sigma_k)} \nabla^{V_k} x^1 \cdot \nabla^{V_k} \tilde{\zeta} d\|V_k\|(X) \\ + \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_\sigma \cap \Sigma_k} (1 + |Du_k^j|^2)^{-1/2} Du_k^j \cdot D\zeta + F_k \quad \text{where}$$

$$(8.5) \quad |F_k| = \left| \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_\sigma} (1 + |Du_k^j|^2)^{-1/2} (1 + (1 + |Du_k^j|^2)^{-1/2})^{-1} |Du_k^j|^2 Du_k^j \cdot D\zeta \right| \\ \leq \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_\sigma} |\nabla^{V_k} x^1|^2 d\|V_k\|(X) \\ + \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_\sigma \cap \Sigma_k} (1 + |Du_k^j|^2)^{-1/2} (1 + (1 + |Du_k^j|^2)^{-1/2})^{-1} |Du_k^j|^2 \\ \leq C \hat{E}_k^2 + q \mathcal{H}^n(\Sigma_k).$$

The last inequality in (8.5), where $C = C(n, \sigma) \in (0, \infty)$, follows from (5.2) and (8.1).

Dividing both sides of (8.4) by $\hat{E}_k$ and letting $k \rightarrow \infty$, we deduce, using (8.1), (8.2) and (8.5), that

$$\sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_\sigma} Dv^j \cdot D\zeta = 0$$

for any $\zeta \in C_c^1(B_\sigma)$. Since $\sigma \in (0, 1)$ is arbitrary, this implies that $\Delta v_a = 0$ in B_1 , establishing property (B3) for $\mathcal{B}_q$.

Next we verify that $\mathcal{B}_q$ satisfies properties (B5) and (B6). Let $z \in B_1$, $\sigma \in (0, (1 - |z|))$ and γ be an orthogonal rotation of $\mathbf{R}^n$, and note that $\tilde{v}_{z,\sigma} \equiv \|v(z + \sigma(\cdot))\|_{L^2(B_1)}^{-1} v(z + \sigma(\cdot))$ is the coarse blow-up of the sequence $\{\eta_{(0,z),\sigma} V_k\}$, and $v \circ \gamma$ is the coarse blow-up of the sequence $\{\tilde{\gamma}_\# V_k\}$, where $\tilde{\gamma} : \mathbf{R}^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ is the orthogonal rotation defined by $\tilde{\gamma}(x^1, x') = (x^1, \gamma(x'))$. Thus $\mathcal{B}_q$ satisfies properties (B5I) and (B5II).

To verify that $\mathcal{B}_q$ satisfies property (B6), let $\{v_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of elements in $\mathcal{B}_q$, and for each $\ell = 1, 2, \dots$, let $\{V_{k_\ell}^\ell\}_{k=1}^\infty \subset \mathcal{S}_\alpha$ be a sequence whose coarse blow-up is v_ℓ . Choose, for each $\ell = 1, 2, \dots$, a positive integer k_ℓ such that $k_1 < k_2 < k_3 < \dots$, $\hat{E}_{V_{k_\ell}^\ell} < \min\{\ell^{-1}, \epsilon_0(n, q, 1 - \ell^{-1})\}$, where ϵ_0 is as in Theorem 5.1, and $\|\hat{E}_{V_{k_\ell}^\ell}^{-1} u_{\ell, k_\ell} - v_\ell\|_{L^2(B_{1-\ell^{-1}})} < \ell^{-1}$, where $u_{\ell, k_\ell} = (u_{\ell, k_\ell}^1, u_{\ell, k_\ell}^2, \dots, u_{\ell, k_\ell}^q) : B_{1-\ell^{-1}} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^q$ is the Lipschitz function (with Lipschitz constant of each component function $\leq 1/2$) corresponding to $u = (u^1, u^2, \dots, u^q)$ of Theorem 5.1 taken with $V_{k_\ell}^\ell$ in place of V and with $\sigma = 1 - \ell^{-1}$. That such a choice exists follows from the definition of coarse blow-up. Note also that it follows from (5.8) and (5.9) that for each $\sigma \in (0, 1)$ and all sufficiently large ℓ , $\int_{B_\sigma} |v_\ell|^2 + |Dv_\ell|^2 < C$, where $C = C(n, q, \sigma) \in (0, \infty)$ is independent of ℓ . Let $v \in \mathcal{B}_q$ be the coarse blow-up of an appropriate subsequence $\{V_{k_{\ell'}}^\ell\}$ of the sequence $\{V_{k_\ell}^\ell\}$. It is then straightforward to check, after passing to a subsequence of $\{\ell'\}$ without changing notation, that for each $\sigma \in (0, 1)$, $v_{\ell'} \rightarrow v$ in $L^2(B_\sigma)$ and weakly in $W^{1,2}(B_\sigma)$.

In order to verify that $\mathcal{B}_q$ satisfies property (B5III), note first that if $y \in \mathbf{R}$ is a constant and $v - y \not\equiv 0$ in B_1 , then $\|v - y\|_{L^2(B_1)}^{-1} (v - y) \in \mathcal{B}_q$, where we have used the notation $v - y = (v^1 - y, v^2 - y, \dots, v^q - y)$. To check this, note that $v(\sigma(\cdot)) - y \not\equiv 0$ for all sufficiently large $\sigma \in (0, 1)$,

and that for any such σ , $\|v(\sigma(\cdot)) - y\|_{L^2(B_1)}^{-1} ((v(\sigma(\cdot)) - y))$ is the coarse blow-up of the sequence $\{\tau_k \# \eta_\sigma \# V_k\}$ where $\tau_k : \mathbf{R}^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ is the translation $X \mapsto X - (\hat{E}_k y, 0)$. Thus $\|v(\sigma(\cdot)) - y\|_{L^2(B_1)}^{-1} (v(\sigma(\cdot)) - y) \in \mathcal{B}_q$ for all sufficiently large $\sigma \in (0, 1)$, and hence it follows from property (B6) that $\|v - y\|_{L^2(B_1)}^{-1} (v - y) \in \mathcal{B}_q$ as claimed. Next note that if $L : \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is a linear function and $v - L \not\equiv 0$ in B_1 , then $\|v - L\|_{L^2(B_1)}^{-1} (v - L) \in \mathcal{B}_q$, where, $v - L = (v^1 - L, v^2 - L, \dots, v^q - L)$. To check this, assume without loss of generality (in view of property (B5II)) that $L(x) = \lambda x^2$ for some $\lambda \in \mathbf{R}$, and note that for sufficiently large $\sigma \in (0, 1)$, $\|v(\sigma(\cdot)) - \sigma L\|_{L^2(B_1)}^{-1} (v(\sigma(\cdot)) - \sigma L)$ is the coarse blow-up of the sequence $\{\Gamma_k \# \eta_\sigma \# V_k\}$, where $\Gamma_k : \mathbf{R}^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ is the rotation fixing $\{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1}$ and mapping the unit normal $\nu_k = (1 + \hat{E}_k^2 \lambda^2)^{-1/2} (1, -\hat{E}_k \lambda, 0)$ to the hyperplane $P_k \equiv \text{graph } \hat{E}_k L$ to e^1 . Thus $\|v(\sigma(\cdot)) - \sigma L\|_{L^2(B_1)}^{-1} (v(\sigma(\cdot)) - \sigma L) \in \mathcal{B}_q$ for all sufficiently large $\sigma \in (0, 1)$, and it follows from property (B6) that $\|v - L\|_{L^2(B_1)}^{-1} (v - L) \in \mathcal{B}_q$ as claimed. We deduce that $\mathcal{B}_q$ satisfies property (B5III) by applying the above facts with $y = v_a(0)$ and with the linear function L defined by $L(x) = \|v - v_a(0)\|_{L^2(B_1)}^{-1} Dv_a(0) \cdot x$ for $x \in \mathbf{R}^n$. (Note that $v - v_a(0) \not\equiv 0$ in B_1 or else $v - \ell_v \equiv 0$ in B_1 , contrary to the hypothesis of (B5III), where ℓ_v is as in the statement of (B5III).) Note that our argument shows more generally that

$$(8.6) \quad v \in \mathcal{B}_q, \quad v - \ell_{v,z} \not\equiv 0 \text{ in } B_1 \implies \|v - \ell_{v,z}\|_{L^2(B_1)}^{-1} (v - \ell_{v,z}) \in \mathcal{B}_q$$

for each $z \in B_1$, where $\ell_{v,z}(x) = v_a(z) + Dv_a(z) \cdot (x - z)$ and $v - \ell_{v,z} = (v^1 - \ell_{v,z}^1, \dots, v^q - \ell_{v,z}^q)$.

Finally, to verify that $\mathcal{B}_q$ satisfies property (B4) (with a constant $C = C(n, q) \in (0, \infty)$ to be specified momentarily), first note that for any stationary integral n -varifold V of $B_2^{n+1}(0)$ satisfying the hypotheses of Theorem 5.1 taken with $\sigma = 15/16$ and any $Z = (z^1, z') \in \text{spt } \|V\| \cap B_{1/8}$ with $\Theta(\|V\|, Z) \geq q$, we have that

$$(8.7) \quad \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_{1/2}(z') \setminus \Sigma} \left(\frac{R_z^2}{(u^j - z^1)^2 + R_z^2} \right)^{\frac{n+2}{2}} R_z^{2-n} \left(\frac{\partial((u^j - z^1)/R_z)}{\partial R_z} \right)^2 d\mathcal{H}^n(x) \leq C_2 \hat{E}_V^2$$

where $R_z(x) = |x - z|$ for $x \in \mathbf{R}^n$ and $C_2 = C_2(n, q) \in (0, \infty)$; the set $\Sigma \subset B_{15/16}$ here and the functions u_j , $j = 1, 2, \dots, q$ are as in Theorem 5.1 taken with $\sigma = 15/16$. To see this, note that by estimating as in (6.3), it follows that

$$\int_{B_{3/4}^{n+1}(Z)} \frac{|(X - Z)^\perp|^2}{|X - Z|^{n+2}} d\|V\|(X) \leq C_2 \hat{E}_V^2, \quad C_2 = C_2(n, q) \in (0, \infty),$$

while

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_{3/4}^{n+1}(Z)} \frac{|(X - Z)^\perp|^2}{|X - Z|^{n+2}} d\|V\|(X) &\geq \int_{\mathbf{R} \times (B_{1/2}(z') \setminus \Sigma)} \frac{|(X - Z)^\perp|^2}{|X - Z|^{n+2}} d\|V\|(X) \\ &\geq \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_{1/2}(z') \setminus \Sigma} \frac{((x' - z') \cdot Du^j(x) + (u^j(x) - z^1))^2}{((u^j(x) - z^1)^2 + (x' - z')^2)^{\frac{n+2}{2}}} d\mathcal{H}^n(x) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_{1/2}(z') \setminus \Sigma} \left(\frac{R_{z'}^2}{(u^j - z^1)^2 + R_{z'}^2} \right)^{\frac{n+2}{2}} R_{z'}^{2-n} \left(\frac{\partial((u^j - z^1)/R_{z'})}{\partial R_{z'}} \right)^2 d\mathcal{H}^n(x). \end{aligned}$$

Now let $v \in \mathcal{B}_q$ and let $z \in B_1$ be such that (B4I) with $C = C_2$, where $C_2 = C_2(n, q)$ is as in (8.7), fails. By (8.6), $\tilde{v} \equiv \|v - \ell_{v,z}\|_{L^2(B_1)}^{-1} (v - \ell_{v,z}) \in \mathcal{B}_q$. Let $V_k \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$ be such that $\tilde{v}$ is the coarse

blow-up of $\{V_k\}$. We claim that then there exists $\sigma_1 > 0$ such that for all sufficiently large k ,

$$(8.8) \quad Z \in \text{spt } \|V_k\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_{\sigma_1}(z)) \implies \Theta(\|V_k\|, Z) < q.$$

If not, then there would exist, for each positive integer ℓ , a positive integer $\{k_\ell\}$ with $k_1 < k_2 < k_3 < \dots$, a point $Z_\ell = (z_\ell^1, z_\ell') \in \text{spt } \|V_{k_\ell}\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_{1/\ell}(z))$ such that $\Theta(\|V_{k_\ell}\|, Z_\ell) \geq q$. Fix any $\rho \in (0, \frac{3}{8}(1 - |z|)]$. Applying (8.7) with $\eta_{Z_\ell, \rho} \# V_{k_\ell}$ in place of V and 0 in place of Z , we then have, after changing variables, that for all sufficiently large ℓ ,

$$(8.9) \quad \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_{\rho/2}(z'_\ell) \setminus \Sigma_{k_\ell}} \left(\frac{R_{z'_\ell}^2}{(u_{k_\ell}^j - z_\ell^1)^2 + R_{z'_\ell}^2} \right)^{\frac{n+2}{2}} R_{z'_\ell}^{2-n} \left(\frac{\partial \left((u_{k_\ell}^j - z_\ell^1)/R_{z'_\ell} \right)}{\partial R_{z'_\ell}} \right)^2 d\mathcal{H}^n(x) \\ \leq C_2 \rho^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_\rho(z'_\ell)} |x^1|^2 d\|V_{k_\ell}\|(X)$$

Now for all sufficiently large ℓ depending on ρ , $\|V_{k_\ell}\|(\mathbf{R} \times B_{\rho/16}(z'_\ell)) \geq C\rho^n$ for a suitable constant $C = C(n) \in (0, \infty)$, so there exists a point $Y_\ell = (y_\ell^1, y'_\ell) \in \text{spt } \|V_{k_\ell}\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times (B_{\rho/16}(z'_\ell)))$ such that

$$(8.10) \quad |y_\ell^1|^2 \leq C\rho^{-n} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_{\rho/16}(z'_\ell)} |x^1|^2 d\|V_{k_\ell}\|(X)$$

where $C = C(n) \in (0, \infty)$. Applying Theorem 6.1(a) with $\tilde{V} = \eta_{Y_\ell, \rho/2} \# V_{k_\ell}$ in place of V and $\tilde{Z} = (\rho/2)^{-1}(Z_\ell - Y_\ell)$ in place of Z (noting that $\tilde{Z} \in \text{spt } \|\tilde{V}\| \cap (B_{1/8} \times \mathbf{R})$ with $\Theta(\|\tilde{V}\|, \tilde{Z}) \geq q$), we deduce, using also (8.10), that

$$(8.11) \quad |z_\ell^1|^2 \leq C\rho^{-n} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_{3\rho/4}(z'_\ell)} |x^1|^2 d\|V_{k_\ell}\|(X)$$

for all sufficiently large ℓ , where $C = C(n, q) \in (0, \infty)$. Dividing both sides of (8.9) by $\hat{E}_{k_\ell}^2$, and letting $\ell \rightarrow \infty$, we conclude, using (8.11) and the fact that $\sup_{X \in \text{spt } \|V_{k_\ell}\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_{3/4})} |x^1| \rightarrow 0$ as $\ell \rightarrow \infty$, that

$$(8.12) \quad \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_{\rho/2}(z)} R_z^{2-n} \left(\frac{\partial \left((\tilde{v}^j - y)/R_z \right)}{\partial R_z} \right)^2 \leq C_2 \rho^{-n-2} \int_{B_\rho(z)} |\tilde{v}|^2$$

for some $y \in \mathbf{R}$ and each $\rho \in (0, \frac{3}{8}(1 - |z|)]$. Since by the triangle inequality this implies that $\int_{B_{\rho/2}(z)} R_z^{2-n} \left(\frac{\partial \left((\tilde{v}_a - y)/R_z \right)}{\partial R_z} \right)^2 < \infty$, it follows that $y = \tilde{v}_a(z) = 0$. But this contradicts our assumption that property $(\mathcal{B}_4 I)$ fails for v , leading us to the conclusion that (8.8) must hold for all sufficiently large k .

By Remark 3 of Section 7 and (8.8), it follows that for all sufficiently large k , $\mathcal{H}^{n-7+\gamma}(\text{sing } V_k \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_{\sigma_1}(z))) = 0$ for every $\gamma > 0$ if $n \geq 7$ and $\text{sing } V_k \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_{\sigma_1}(z)) = \emptyset$ if $2 \leq n \leq 6$, so we may apply Theorem 3.4 and standard elliptic theory to conclude that

$$V_k \llcorner (\mathbf{R} \times B_{\sigma_1/2}(z)) = \sum_{j=1}^q |\text{graph } u_k^j|$$

where $u_k^j : B_{\sigma_1/2}(z) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ are C^2 functions satisfying

$$\sup_{B_{\sigma_1/2}(z)} \sum_{j=1}^q |Du_k^j| + |D^2 u_k^j| \leq C\hat{E}_k$$

and solving the minimal surface equation on $B_{\sigma_1/2}(z)$, where $C = C(n, q, \sigma) \in (0, \infty)$. This readily shows that $\Delta \tilde{v}^j = 0$ on $B_{\sigma_1/2}(z)$ for each $j = 1, 2, \dots, q$, establishing property $(\mathcal{B}4)$ for $\mathcal{B}_q$.

Remark: Note that the argument leading to (8.12) proves the following:

Let Ω be an open subset of $B_{3/4}$. If $v \in \mathcal{B}_q$ and $\{V_k\} \subset \mathcal{S}_\alpha$ is a sequence whose coarse blow-up is v (in the sense described in Section 5), and if for infinitely many k , there are points $Z_k \in \text{spt } \|V_k\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times \Omega)$ with $\Theta(\|V_k\|, Z_k) \geq q$, then there exists a point $z \in \overline{\Omega}$ such that

$$\sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_{\rho/2}(z)} R_z^{2-n} \left(\frac{\partial ((v^j - v_a(z))/R_z)}{\partial R_z} \right)^2 \leq C_2 \rho^{-n-2} \int_{B_\rho(z)} |v|^2$$

for each $\rho \in (0, \frac{3}{8}(1 - |z|)]$.

9. PROPERTIES OF COARSE BLOW-UPS: PART II

Fix an integer $q \geq 2$ and suppose that the induction hypotheses $(H1)$, $(H2)$ hold. We begin in this section the proof that the coarse blow-up class $\mathcal{B}_q$ satisfies property $(\mathcal{B}7)$; we shall complete the proof in Section 14.

Suppose

(†) $v_\star = (v_\star^1, v_\star^2, \dots, v_\star^q) \in \mathcal{B}_q$ is such that for each $j = 1, 2, \dots, q$, there exist two linear functions $L_1^j, L_2^j : \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ with $L_1^j(0, y) = L_2^j(0, y) = 0$ for each $y \in \mathbf{R}^{n-1}$, $v_\star^j(x^2, y) = L_1^j(x^2, y)$ if $x^2 < 0$ and $v_\star^j(x^2, y) = L_2^j(x^2, y)$ if $x^2 \geq 0$.

In order to show that $\mathcal{B}_q$ satisfies property $(\mathcal{B}7)$, we need to prove that $v_\star^1 = v_\star^2 = \dots = v_\star^q = L$ for some linear function $L : \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$. We shall do this by establishing the assertions in each of the following two cases:

Case 1: There exists no $v_\star \in \mathcal{B}_q$ as in (†) above such that $L_1^1 = L_1^2 = \dots = L_1^q$ but $L_2^j \neq L_2^{j+1}$ for some $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, q-1\}$.

Case 2: There exists no $v_\star \in \mathcal{B}_q$ as in (†) above such that $L_1^i \neq L_1^{i+1}$ for some $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, q-1\}$ and $L_2^j \neq L_2^{j+1}$ for some $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, q-1\}$.

We prove the assertion of **Case 1** in Lemma 9.1 below and complete the proof that $\mathcal{B}_q$ satisfies property $(\mathcal{B}7)$ (by proving the assertion of **Case 2**) in Corollary 14.2; the latter requires a number of preliminary results which we shall establish in Sections 10-14.

Lemma 9.1. *Let $v_\star$ and L_i^j , $i \in \{1, 2\}$, $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, q\}$, be as in (†) above. If $L_1^1 = L_1^2 = \dots = L_1^q$, then (i) $L_2^1 = L_2^2 = \dots = L_2^q$ and (ii) $v_\star^j = L$ for some linear function L and all $j = 1, 2, \dots, q$.*

Proof. The assertion of (ii) follows from that of (i) since the average $(v_\star)_a = q^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^q v_\star^j$ is harmonic and hence is a linear function under the hypotheses of the lemma.

Suppose, contrary to the assertion of (i), that $L_2^j \neq L_2^{j+1}$ for some $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, q-1\}$. By property $(\mathcal{B}5III)$, $\frac{v_\star - (v_\star)_a}{\|v_\star - (v_\star)_a\|} \in \mathcal{B}_q$, so we may assume without loss of generality that $L_1^j = 0$ for each $j = 1, 2, \dots, q$. For $k = 1, 2, \dots$, let $V_k \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$ with $(\omega_n 2^n)^{-1} \|V_k\|(B_2^{n+1}(0)) < q + 1/2$, $q - 1/2 \leq \omega_n^{-1} \|V_k\|(\mathbf{R} \times B_1) < q + 1/2$ and $\hat{E}_k^2 = \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} |x^1|^2 d\|V_k\|(X) \rightarrow 0$ be such that the coarse blow-up of the sequence V_k , obtained as described in Section 5, is $v_\star$. Let the notation be as in Section 5. Thus for each $\sigma \in (0, 1)$ and each sufficiently large k (depending on σ), there exists

Lipschitz functions $u_k^j : B_\sigma \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, q$, with $\text{Lip } u_k^j \leq 1/2$ for each $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, q\}$, such that

$$v_\star^j = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \hat{E}_k^{-1} u_k^j$$

where the convergence is in $L^2(B_\sigma)$ and weakly in $W^{1,2}(B_\sigma)$, and

$$(9.1) \quad \text{spt } \|V_k\| \cap \pi^{-1}(B_\sigma \setminus \Sigma_k) = \cup_{j=1}^q \text{graph } u_k^j \cap \pi^{-1}(B_\sigma \setminus \Sigma_k)$$

where $\Sigma_k \subset B_\sigma$ is the set corresponding to Σ in Theorem 5.1 when V is replaced with V_k , so that in particular

$$(9.2) \quad \|V_k\|(\mathbf{R} \times \Sigma_k) + \mathcal{H}^n(\Sigma_k) \leq C \hat{E}_k^2$$

where $C = C(n, q, \sigma) \in (0, \infty)$.

In what follows, we take $\sigma \in [15/16, 1)$ to be fixed. Fix any $\tau \in (0, 1/16)$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{(\mathbf{R} \times B_{9/16}) \cap \{x^2 \leq -\tau/2\}} |x^1|^2 d\|V_k\|(X) &= \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{(B_{9/16} \setminus \Sigma_k) \cap \{x^2 \leq -\tau/2\}} \sqrt{1 + |Du_k^j|^2} |u_k^j|^2 d\mathcal{H}^n \\ &\quad + \int_{(\mathbf{R} \times (B_{9/16} \cap \Sigma_k)) \cap \{x^2 \leq -\tau/2\}} |x^1|^2 d\|V_k\|(X), \end{aligned}$$

$\hat{E}_k^{-1} u_k \rightarrow 0$ in L^2 on $B_{9/16} \cap \{x^2 \leq -\tau/2\}$ and

$$\sup_{X=(x^1, x') \in \text{spt } \|V_k\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_{9/16})} |x^1| \rightarrow 0,$$

it follows from (9.2) that

$$\hat{E}_k^{-2} \int_{(\mathbf{R} \times B_{9/16}) \cap \{x^2 \leq -\tau/2\}} |x^1|^2 d\|V_k\|(X) \rightarrow 0$$

and consequently, by (5.2), that

$$(9.3) \quad \hat{E}_k^{-2} \int_{(\mathbf{R} \times B_{1/2}) \cap \{x^2 \leq -\tau\}} |\nabla^{V_k} x^1|^2 d\|V_k\|(X) \rightarrow 0.$$

We claim that for all sufficiently large k ,

$$(9.4) \quad \Theta(\|V_k\|, Z) < q \text{ for all } Z \in \text{spt } \|V_k\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_{5/8}) \cap \{x^2 > \tau/8\}.$$

If this were false, then there would exist a subsequence $\{k'\}$ of $\{k\}$ and for each k' , a point $Z_{k'} = (z_{k'}^1, z_{k'}') \in \text{spt } \|V_{k'}\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_{5/8}) \cap \{x^2 > \tau/8\}$ with $\Theta(\|V_{k'}\|, Z_{k'}) \geq q$; by the reasoning as in the Remark at the end of Section 8, this fact yields

$$\sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_{1/4}(z')} R_{z'}^{2-n} \left(\frac{\partial \left((v_\star^j - y)/R_{z'} \right)}{\partial R_{z'}} \right)^2 d\mathcal{H}^n \leq C$$

for some $z' \in \overline{B_{5/8}} \cap \{x^2 \geq \tau/8\}$ and some $y \in \mathbf{R}$, which implies that $v_\star^j(z') = y$ for all $j = 1, 2, \dots, q$. But this contradicts our hypothesis that $L_2^j \neq L_2^{j+1}$ for some $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, q-1\}$, so (9.4) must hold for all sufficiently large k .

With the help of Remark 3 of Section 7, we deduce from (9.4) that for all sufficiently large k , $\mathcal{H}^{n-7+\gamma}(\text{sing } V_k \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_{5/8}) \cap \{x^2 > \tau/8\}) = 0$ for each $\gamma > 0$ if $n \geq 7$ and $\text{sing } V_k \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_{5/8}) \cap \{x^2 >$

$\tau/8\} = \emptyset$ if $2 \leq n \leq 6$. We may therefore apply Theorem 3.4 and elliptic theory to deduce that, for all sufficiently large k , $\Sigma_k \cap B_{9/16} \cap \{x^2 > \tau/4\} = \emptyset$;

$$(9.5) \quad V_k \llcorner ((\mathbf{R} \times B_{9/16}) \cap \{x^2 > \tau/4\}) = \sum_{j=1}^q |\text{graph } u_k^j| \llcorner ((\mathbf{R} \times B_{9/16}) \cap \{x^2 > \tau/4\});$$

and that u_k^j are C^2 on $B_{9/16} \cap \{x^2 > \tau/4\}$, solve the minimal surface equation there and satisfy

$$(9.6) \quad \sup_{B_{1/2} \cap \{x^2 > \tau/4\}} |D^\ell u_k|^2 \leq C_\tau \hat{E}_k^2$$

for $\ell = 0, 1, 2$, where C_τ is a constant depending only on n and τ , and D^ℓ denotes the order ℓ differentiation.

We next claim that for all sufficiently large k ,

$$(9.7) \quad (\{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1}) \cap B_{1/2} \subset (\{Z \in \text{spt } \|V_k\| : \Theta(\|V_k\|, Z) \geq q\})_\tau.$$

If this were false, then there would exist a point $(0, y) \in \{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1} \cap \overline{B}_{1/2}$ and a subsequence $\{k'\}$ of $\{k\}$ such that for each k' ,

$$B_{3\tau/4}^{n+1}((0, y)) \cap \{Z \in \text{spt } \|V_{k'}\| : \Theta(\|V_{k'}\|, Z) \geq q\} = \emptyset.$$

Since $\text{spt } \|V_k\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_{3/4}) \rightarrow B_{3/4} \times \{0\}$ in Hausdorff distance, it follows that for each k' and each $Z \in \text{spt } \|V_{k'}\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_{\tau/2}((0, y)))$ we must have $\Theta(\|V_{k'}\|, Z) < q$. Arguing exactly as for (9.5) and (9.6), we conclude that for all sufficiently large k' , $\Sigma_{k'} \cap B_{\tau/4}(0, y) = \emptyset$;

$$\text{spt } \|V_{k'}\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_{\tau/4}(0, y)) = \cup_{j=1}^q \text{graph } u_{k'}^j \Big|_{B_{\tau/4}(0, y)};$$

and that $u_{k'}^j$ are C^2 functions on $B_{\tau/4}(0, y)$, satisfy

$$\sum_{j=1}^q \sup_{B_{\tau/4}(0, y)} |Du_{k'}^j| + |D^2 u_{k'}^j| \leq C \hat{E}_{k'}, \quad C = C(n, \tau) \in (0, \infty)$$

and solve the minimal surface equation on $B_{\tau/4}(0, y)$. Consequently, $v_\star^j|_{B_{\tau/4}(0, y)}$ must be harmonic for each $j = 1, 2, \dots, q$, which is however impossible since by hypothesis, $L_1^j = 0$ for each $j = 1, 2, \dots, q$ while $L_2^j \neq L_2^{j+1}$ for some $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, q-1\}$. This contradiction establishes (9.7) for all sufficiently large k .

We now proceed to derive the contradiction needed for the proof of the lemma. By taking $\psi(X) = \tilde{\zeta}(X)e^2$ in the first variation formula (3.1), we deduce that

$$(9.8) \quad \int \nabla^{V_k} x^2 \cdot \nabla^{V_k} \tilde{\zeta}(X) d\|V_k\|(X) = 0$$

for each $k = 1, 2, \dots$ and each $\tilde{\zeta} \in C_c^1(\mathbf{R} \times B_1)$. Choosing $\tilde{\zeta}$ to agree with $\zeta'(x^1, x') = \zeta(x')$ in a neighborhood of $\text{spt } \|V\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_{1/4})$, where $\zeta \in C_c^1(B_{1/4})$ is arbitrary, we deduce from this that

$$(9.9) \quad \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_{1/4}} \sqrt{1 + |Du_k^j|^2} \left(D_2 \zeta - \frac{D_2 u_k^j (D\zeta \cdot Du_k^j)}{1 + |Du_k^j|^2} \right) = F_k, \quad \text{where}$$

$$F_k = - \int_{\mathbf{R} \times (B_{1/4} \cap \Sigma_k)} \nabla^{V_k} x^2 \cdot \nabla^{V_k} \tilde{\zeta}(X) d\|V_k\|(X) \\ + \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_{1/4} \cap \Sigma_k} \sqrt{1 + |Du_k^j|^2} \left(D_2 \zeta - \frac{D_2 u_k^j (D\zeta \cdot Du_k^j)}{1 + |Du_k^j|^2} \right)$$

Since $\int_{B_{1/4}} D_2 \zeta = 0$, it follows from (9.9) that

$$(9.10) \quad \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_{1/4}} \frac{|Du_k^j|^2}{1 + \sqrt{1 + |Du_k^j|^2}} D_2 \zeta - \frac{D_2 u_k^j (D\zeta \cdot Du_k^j)}{\sqrt{1 + |Du_k^j|^2}} = F_k.$$

Note that by (9.5), (9.6) and the definition of Σ_k (see Theorem 5.1),

$$(9.11) \quad B_{1/4} \cap \Sigma_k \subset B_{1/4} \cap \{x^2 < \tau/2\},$$

and also that for all sufficiently large k ,

$$(9.12) \quad \|V_k\|(\mathbf{R} \times (B_{1/4} \cap \Sigma_k)) + \mathcal{H}^n(B_{1/4} \cap \Sigma_k) \leq C \int_{(\mathbf{R} \times B_{1/2}) \cap \{x^2 < \tau\}} |\nabla^{V_k} x^1|^2 d\|V_k\|(X)$$

where $C \in (0, \infty)$ is a fixed constant depending only on n and q . To see (9.12), let $\tilde{\Sigma}_k^{(j)}$, $j = 1, 2, 3$, correspond to the set $\tilde{\Sigma}_j$ in Theorem 5.1 when V is replaced by V_k , and Σ'_k correspond to Σ' . Since for each k , $\rho \in (\tau/4, 1/16)$ and $Y \in \text{spt } \|V_k\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_{1/2})$, we trivially have that

$$(9.13) \quad \rho^{-n} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_\rho(\pi Y)} |\nabla^{V_k} x^1|^2 d\|V_k\|(X) \leq 4^n \tau^{-n} \int_{B_{3/4} \times \mathbf{R}} |\nabla^{V_k} x^1|^2 d\|V_k\|(X) = 4^n \tau^{-n} \hat{E}_k^2,$$

and since by definition,

$$\tilde{\Sigma}_k^{(1)} = \{Y \in \text{spt } \|V_k\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_\sigma) : \rho^{-n} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_\rho(\pi Y)} |\nabla^{V_k} x^1|^2 d\|V_k\|(X) \geq \xi \\ \text{for some } \rho \in (0, (1 - \sigma))\}$$

where $\xi = \xi(n, q) \in (0, 1/2)$ is as in Theorem 5.1, it follows that for all sufficiently large k (depending on τ), $Y \in \tilde{\Sigma}_k^{(1)}$ if and only if $Y \in \text{spt } \|V_k\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_\sigma)$ and $\rho^{-n} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_\rho(\pi Y)} |\nabla^{V_k} x^1|^2 d\|V_k\|(X) \geq \xi$ for some $\rho \in (0, \tau/4]$. In view of (9.11), it follows from the Besicovitch covering lemma that

$$\|V_k\|(\mathbf{R} \times (B_{1/4} \cap \tilde{\Sigma}_k^{(j)})) + \mathcal{H}^n(B_{1/4} \cap \pi \tilde{\Sigma}_k^{(j)}) \leq C \int_{(B_{1/2} \times \mathbf{R}) \cap \{x^n < \tau\}} |\nabla^{V_k} x^1|^2 d\|V_k\|(X)$$

for $j = 1$, where $C = C(n, q) \in (0, \infty)$. This estimate trivially follows for $j = 2$ since $\|V_k\|(\tilde{\Sigma}_k^{(2)}) = 0$ (see [[Alm83], Theorem 3.8]); it follows for $j = 3$, with $C = 4$, directly from the definition of $\tilde{\Sigma}_k^{(3)}$ and (9.11) and it also holds with Σ'_k in place of $\tilde{\Sigma}_k^{(j)}$, with $C = C(n, q) \in (0, \infty)$, by (9.11) and the argument in [[Alm83], pp. 237-238]. Thus the estimate (9.12), with the constant C depending only on n and q (in particular independent of τ) follows.

By (9.12), Theorem 6.1(b) (with $\mu = 1/2$) and (9.3) we deduce that, since the integrands in both integral expressions in F_k are bounded,

$$(9.14) \quad \hat{E}_k^{-2} |F_k| \leq C \sup |D\zeta| \tau^{1/2}$$

for all sufficiently large k , where $C = C(n)$.

Abbreviating $w_k = \sum_{j=1}^q \frac{|Du_k^j|^2}{1+\sqrt{1+|Du_k^j|^2}} D_2 \zeta - \frac{D_2 u_k^j (D\zeta \cdot Du_k^j)}{\sqrt{1+|Du_k^j|^2}}$, note that

$$\int_{B_{1/4} \setminus \Sigma_k \cap \{x^2 \leq \tau\}} |w_k| \leq C \sup |D\zeta| \int_{(\mathbf{R} \times B_{1/2}) \cap \{x^2 \leq \tau\}} |\nabla^{V_k} x^1|^2 d\|V_k\|(X),$$

and by (9.12),

$$\int_{B_{1/4} \cap \Sigma_k} |w_k| \leq C \sup |D\zeta| \int_{(\mathbf{R} \times B_{1/2}) \cap \{x^2 \leq \tau\}} |\nabla^{V_k} x^1|^2 d\|V_k\|(X)$$

where $C = C(n)$, so that again by Theorem 6.1(b) with $\mu = 1/2$ and (9.3),

$$(9.15) \quad \hat{E}_k^{-2} \left(\int_{B_{1/4} \setminus \Sigma_k \cap \{x^2 \leq \tau\}} |w_k| + \int_{B_{1/4} \cap \Sigma_k} |w_k| \right) \leq C \sup |D\zeta| \tau^{1/2}$$

for all sufficiently large k , where $C = C(n)$. Finally, by (9.6),

$$(9.16) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \hat{E}_k^{-2} \int_{B_{1/4} \cap \{x^2 \geq \tau\}} w_k = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_{1/4} \cap \{x^2 \geq \tau\}} |D_2 v_\star^j|^2 D_2 \zeta$$

where we have used the fact that $D_i v_\star^j \equiv 0$ for $i = 3, \dots, (n+1)$ and $j = 1, 2, \dots, q$. Dividing (9.10) by $\hat{E}_k^2$ and first letting $k \rightarrow \infty$ and then letting $\tau \rightarrow 0$, we conclude from (9.14), (9.15) and (9.16) that

$$\sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_{1/4} \cap \{x^2 \geq 0\}} |D_2 v_\star^j|^2 D_2 \zeta = 0$$

for any $\zeta \in C_c^1(B_{1/4})$. Since $v_\star^j = L_2^j$ on $\{x^2 \geq 0\}$, this contradicts (for any choice of $\zeta \in C_c^1(B_{1/4})$ with $\int_{B_{1/4} \cap \{x^2 \geq 0\}} D_n \zeta \neq 0$) our assumption that $L_2^j \neq L_2^{j+1}$ for some $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, q-1\}$. $\square$

Remark: It follows from Lemma 9.1 and the compactness property $(\mathcal{B}6)$ that there exists a constant $c = c(n, q) \in (0, \infty)$ with the following property: If $v \in \mathcal{B}_q$ is such that, for each $j = 1, 2, \dots, q$, $v^j(x^2, y) = \ell_j x^2$ for $x^2 < 0$; $v^j(x^2, y) = m_j x^2$ for $x^2 \geq 0$, where ℓ_j, m_j are constants; and $v^j \not\equiv v_a$ for some $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, q\}$, where $v_a \equiv q^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^q v^j$, then $|\ell_1 - \ell_q|^2 \geq c \sum_{j=1}^q \|v^j - v_a\|_{L^2(B_1)}^2$ and $|m_1 - m_q|^2 \geq c \sum_{j=1}^q \|v^j - v_a\|_{L^2(B_1)}^2$. (Of course once we have completed the proof that $\mathcal{B}_q$ satisfies property $(\mathcal{B}7)$, we will have ruled out the existence of such $v \in \mathcal{B}_q$.)

10. PARAMETRIC L^2 -ESTIMATES IN TERMS OF FINE EXCESS

This section and all of the subsequent sections up to and including Section 14 will be devoted to the proof of the assertion of **Case 2** (see the beginning of Section 9). Crucial to our proof are the L^2 -estimates, given in Theorem 10.1 and Corollary 10.2 below, for varifolds $V \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$ with small coarse excess (relative to a hyperplane) and lower order “fine excess” relative to appropriate unions of half-hyperplanes meeting along $(n-1)$ -dimensional axes (see Hypotheses 10.1(5) below). These results are adaptations to the present “higher multiplicity” setting of those proved in ([Sim93]) in the context of “multiplicity 1 classes” of minimal submanifolds.

Notation: (1) Let $\mathcal{C}_q$ denote the set of hypercones $\mathbf{C}$ of $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ such that $\mathbf{C} = \sum_{j=1}^q |H_j| + |G_j|$, where for each $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, q\}$, H_j is the half-hyperplane defined by

$$H_j = \{(x^1, x^2, y) \in \mathbf{R}^{n+1} : x^2 < 0 \text{ and } x^1 = \lambda_j x^2\},$$

G_j the half-hyperplane defined by

$$G_j = \{(x^1, x^2, y) \in \mathbf{R}^{n+1} : x^2 > 0 \text{ and } x^1 = \mu_j x^2\},$$

with λ_j, μ_j constants, $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_q$ and $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2 \leq \dots \leq \mu_q$. Note that we do *not* assume cones in $\mathcal{C}_q$ are stationary in $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$.

(2) For $p \in \{2, 3, \dots, 2q\}$, let $\mathcal{C}_q(p)$ denote the set of hypercones $\mathbf{C} = \sum_{j=1}^q |H_j| + |G_j| \in \mathcal{C}_q$ as defined above such that the number of *distinct* half-hyperplanes in the set $\{H_1, \dots, H_q, G_1, \dots, G_q\}$ is p . Then $\mathcal{C}_q = \bigcup_{p=2}^{2q} \mathcal{C}_q(p)$.

(3) For $V \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$ and $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C}_q$ define a height excess (“fine excess”) $Q_V(\mathbf{C})$ of V relative to $\mathbf{C}$ by

$$Q_V^2(\mathbf{C}) = \left(\int_{\mathbf{R} \times (B_{1/2} \setminus \{|x^2| < 1/16\})} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|V\|) d\|\mathbf{C}\|(X) + \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}\|) d\|V\|(X) \right).$$

(4) For $p \in \{2, \dots, 2q\}$, let

$$Q_V^*(p) = \inf_{\mathbf{C} \in \bigcup_{k=4}^p \mathcal{C}_q(p)} Q_V(\mathbf{C}).$$

Let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and q be an integer ≥ 2 . In Theorem 10.1, Corollary 10.2 and Lemma 10.3 below and subsequently, we shall consider the following set of hypotheses for appropriately small $\epsilon, \gamma \in (0, 1)$ to be determined depending only on n, q and α :

Hypotheses 10.1.

- (1) $V \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$, $\Theta(\|V\|, 0) \geq q$, $(\omega_n 2^n)^{-1} \|V\|(B_2^{n+1}(0)) < q + 1/2$, $\omega_n^{-1} \|V\|(\mathbf{R} \times B_1) < q + 1/2$.
- (2) $\mathbf{C} = \sum_{j=1}^q |H_j| + |G_j| \in \mathcal{C}_q$, where for each $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, q\}$, H_j is the half-hyperplane defined by $H_j = \{(x^1, x^2, y) \in \mathbf{R}^{n+1} : x^2 < 0 \text{ and } x^1 = \lambda_j x^2\}$, G_j the half-hyperplane defined by $G_j = \{(x^1, x^2, y) \in \mathbf{R}^{n+1} : x^2 > 0 \text{ and } x^1 = \mu_j x^2\}$, with λ_j, μ_j constants, $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_q$ and $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2 \leq \dots \leq \mu_q$.
- (3) $\hat{E}_V^2 \equiv \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} |x^1|^2 d\|V\|(X) < \epsilon$.
- (4) $\{Z : \Theta(\|V\|, Z) \geq q\} \cap (\mathbf{R} \times (B_{1/2} \setminus \{|x^2| < 1/16\})) = \emptyset$.
- (5) $Q_V^2(\mathbf{C}) < \gamma \hat{E}_V^2$.

Remark: Note that there exists $\epsilon = \epsilon(n, q) \in (0, 1)$ such that if Hypotheses 10.1 above hold with any $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, and the induction hypotheses (H1), (H2) hold, then

$$(10.1) \quad \max\{|\lambda_1|, |\lambda_q|\} \leq c_1 \hat{E}_V \quad \text{and} \quad \max\{|\mu_1|, |\mu_q|\} \leq c_1 \hat{E}_V.$$

for some constant $c_1 = c_1(n) \in (0, \infty)$. These bounds follow from Hypotheses 10.1(5) in view of the fact that (by Hypotheses 10.1(4), Remark 3 of Section 7 and Theorem 3.4), under Hypotheses 10.1, $V \llcorner (\mathbf{R} \times (B_{1/4} \setminus \{|x^2| < 1/8\})) = \sum_{j=1}^q |\text{graph } \tilde{u}_j| + |\text{graph } \tilde{w}_j|$ where, for $j = 1, 2, \dots, q$, $\tilde{u}_j \in C^2(B_{1/4} \cap \{x^2 < -1/8\})$, $\tilde{w}_j \in C^2(B_{1/4} \cap \{x^2 > 1/8\})$ with $\sup_{B_{1/4} \cap \{x^2 < -1/8\}} |\tilde{u}_j| \leq C \hat{E}_V$ and $\sup_{B_{1/4} \cap \{x^2 > 1/8\}} |\tilde{w}_j| \leq C \hat{E}_V$, $C = C(n) \in (0, \infty)$.

Let $c_1 = c_1(n)$ be the constant as in (10.1) above and define a constant $M_0 = M_0(n, q) \in (0, \infty)$ by

$$M_0 = \max \left\{ \frac{3}{2}, \frac{2^{2n+8} \omega_n^2 (2q+1)^2 c_1^2}{\overline{C}_1}, \frac{2^{2n+8} \omega_n (2q+1)}{\overline{C}_1} \right\}$$

where $\overline{C}_1 = \int_{B_{1/2} \cap \{x^2 > 1/16\}} |x^2|^2 d\mathcal{H}^n(x^2, y)$. We shall use this constant at several places below.

For V as in Hypotheses 10.1, we shall also assume the following for suitable values of $M > 1$:

Hypothesis (★):

$$\hat{E}_V^2 < M \inf_{\{P=\{x^1=\lambda x^2\} \in G_n : \lambda \in \mathbf{R}\}} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, P), d\|V\|(X).$$

Remarks: (1) Note that if Hypotheses 10.1 and Hypothesis (★) hold with sufficiently small $\epsilon = \epsilon(n, q) \in (0, 1)$, $\gamma = \gamma(n, q) \in (0, 1)$ and with $M = \frac{3}{2}M_0^4$, then

$$(10.2) \quad \begin{aligned} c\hat{E}_V &\leq \max\{|\lambda_1|, |\lambda_q|\}, \quad c\hat{E}_V \leq \max\{|\mu_1|, |\mu_q|\} \quad \text{and} \\ \min\{|\lambda_1 - \lambda_q|, |\mu_1 - \mu_q|\} &\geq 2c\hat{E}_V \end{aligned}$$

for some constant $c = c(n, q) \in (0, \infty)$. Indeed, the triangle inequality (in the form $\text{dist}^2(X, P) \leq 2\text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt}\|\mathbf{C}\|) + 2\text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}^2(P \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1), \text{spt}\|\mathbf{C}\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1))$ for $X \in \mathbf{R} \times B_1$, applied with $P = \{x^1 = \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_1 + \lambda_q)x^2\}$ or $P = \{x^1 = \frac{1}{2}(\mu_1 + \mu_q)x^2\}$, Hypothesis (★) (with $M = M_0^4$) and Hypotheses 10.1 (with sufficiently small $\epsilon = \epsilon(n, q) \in (0, 1)$ and $\gamma = \gamma(n, q) \in (0, 1)$) imply that $|\lambda_1 - \lambda_q| + |\mu_1 - \mu_q| \geq \tilde{c}\hat{E}_V$ for some $\tilde{c} = \tilde{c}(n, q) \in (0, \infty)$. Lemma 9.1 then implies that $\min\{|\lambda_1 - \lambda_q|, |\mu_1 - \mu_q|\} \geq 2c\hat{E}_V$, $c = c(n, q) \in (0, 1)$; the first two inequalities of (10.2) follow readily from this.

(2) It follows from the last inequality of (10.2) that if Hypotheses 10.1 and Hypothesis (★) hold with $\epsilon = \epsilon(n, q)$, $\gamma = \gamma(n, q) \in (0, 1)$ sufficiently small and $M = M_0^4$, then $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C}_q(p)$ for some $p \in \{4, 5, \dots, 2q\}$.

Finally, for $\mathbf{C}$, V as in Hypotheses 10.1 and appropriately small $\beta \in (0, 1/2)$ (to be determined depending only on n, q and α), we will also need to consider the following:

Hypothesis (★★): *Either*

- (i) $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C}_q(4)$ or
- (ii) $q \geq 3$, $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C}_q(p)$ for some $p \in \{5, \dots, 2q\}$ and $Q_V^2(\mathbf{C}) < \beta(Q_V^*(p-1))^2$.

Remarks: (1) Let $\mathbf{C}$ be as in Hypothesis 10.1(2). If $V \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$ satisfies Hypothesis 10.1(1), Hypothesis (★★)(ii) with $\beta \in (0, 1/4)$ and if $\lambda_1 = \lambda'_1 > \lambda'_2 > \dots > \lambda'_{p_1} = \lambda_q$ are the distinct elements of the set $\{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_q\}$ and $\mu_1 = \mu'_1 < \mu'_2 < \dots < \mu'_{p_2} = \mu_q$ are the distinct elements of $\{\mu_1, \dots, \mu_q\}$ (notation as in Hypothesis 10.1(2)), then it follows from Hypothesis (★★) and the triangle inequality that

$$(10.3) \quad \lambda'_{i+1} - \lambda'_i \geq 2c'Q_V^*(p-1), \quad \mu'_{j+1} - \mu'_j \geq 2c'Q_V^*(p-1)$$

for some constant $c' = c'(n, q) \in (0, \infty)$ and all $i = 1, 2, \dots, p_1 - 1$ and $j = 1, 2, \dots, p_2 - 1$.

(2) Suppose $V \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$, $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C}_q$ satisfy Hypotheses 10.1, Hypothesis (★) and Hypothesis (★★) for some $\epsilon, \gamma, \beta \in (0, 1/2)$. If $\mathbf{C}' \in \mathcal{C}_q$ is any other cone with $\text{spt}\|\mathbf{C}'\| = \text{spt}\|\mathbf{C}\|$, then Hypotheses 10.1, Hypothesis (★) and Hypothesis (★★) will continue to be satisfied with $\mathbf{C}'$ in place of $\mathbf{C}$ provided γ, β are replaced by $2q\gamma, 2q\beta$ respectively.

Theorem 10.1. *Let q be an integer ≥ 2 , $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, $\tau \in (0, 1/8)$ and $\mu \in (0, 1)$. There exist numbers $\epsilon_0 = \epsilon_0(n, q, \alpha, \tau) \in (0, 1)$, $\gamma_0 = \gamma_0(n, q, \alpha, \tau) \in (0, 1)$ and $\beta_0 = \beta_0(n, q, \alpha, \tau) \in (0, 1)$ such that the following is true: Let $V \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$, $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C}_q$ satisfy Hypotheses 10.1, Hypothesis (★) and Hypothesis (★★) with $M = \frac{3}{2}M_0^4$ and $\epsilon_0, \gamma_0, \beta_0$ in place of ϵ, γ, β respectively. Suppose also that the induction hypotheses (H1), (H2) hold. Write $\mathbf{C} = \sum_{j=1}^q |H_j| + |G_j|$ where for each $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, q\}$, H_j is the half-space defined by $H_j = \{(x^1, x^2, y) \in \mathbf{R}^{n+1} : x^2 < 0 \text{ and } x^1 = \lambda_j x^2\}$, G_j the half-space defined by $G_j = \{(x^1, x^2, y) \in \mathbf{R}^{n+1} : x^2 > 0 \text{ and } x^1 = \mu_j x^2\}$, with λ_j, μ_j constants, $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_q$ and $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2 \leq \dots \leq \mu_q$; for $(x^2, y) \in \mathbf{R}^n$ and $j = 1, 2, \dots, q$, define*

$h_j(x^2, y) = \lambda_j x^2$ and $g_j(x^2, y) = \mu_j x^2$. Then, after possibly replacing $\mathbf{C}$ with another cone $\mathbf{C}' \in \mathcal{C}_q$ with $\text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}'\| = \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}\|$ and relabeling $\mathbf{C}'$ as $\mathbf{C}$ (see the preceding Remark (2)), the following must hold:

$$(a) \quad V \llcorner (\mathbf{R} \times (B_{3/4} \setminus \{|x^2| < \tau\})) = \sum_{j=1}^q |\text{graph}(h_j + u_j)| + |\text{graph}(g_j + w_j)|$$

where, for each $j = 1, 2, \dots, q$, $u_j \in C^2(B_{3/4} \cap \{x^2 < -\tau\})$; $w_j \in C^2(B_{3/4} \cap \{x^2 > \tau\})$;

$h_j + u_j$ and $g_j + w_j$ solve the minimal surface equation on their respective domains;

$h_1 + u_1 \leq h_2 + u_2 \leq \dots \leq h_q + u_q$; $g_1 + w_1 \leq g_2 + w_2 \leq \dots \leq g_q + w_q$;

$\text{dist}((h_j(x^2, y) + u_j(x^2, y), x^2, y), \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}\|) = (1 + \lambda_j^2)^{-1/2} |u_j(x^2, y)|$, $(x^2, y) \in B_{3/4} \cap \{x^2 < -\tau\}$;

$\text{dist}((g_j(x^2, y) + w_j(x^2, y), x^2, y), \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}\|) = (1 + \mu_j^2)^{-1/2} |w_j(x^2, y)|$, $(x^2, y) \in B_{3/4} \cap \{x^2 > \tau\}$.

$$(b) \quad \int_{B_{1/2}^{n+1}(0)} \frac{|X^\perp|^2}{|X|^{n+2}} d\|V\|(X) \leq C \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}\|) d\|V\|(X).$$

$$(c) \quad \sum_{j=3}^{n+1} \int_{B_{1/2}^{n+1}(0)} |e_j^\perp|^2 d\|V\|(X) \leq C \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}\|) d\|V\|(X).$$

$$(d) \quad \int_{B_{1/2}^{n+1}(0)} \frac{\text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}\|)}{|X|^{n+2-\mu}} d\|V\|(X) \leq \tilde{C} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}\|) d\|V\|(X).$$

Here $C = C(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty)$ and $\tilde{C} = \tilde{C}(n, q, \alpha, \mu) \in (0, \infty)$. (In particular, $C, \tilde{C}$ do not depend on τ).

Proof. Let $\lambda_1 = \lambda'_1 > \lambda'_2 > \dots > \lambda'_{p_1} = \lambda_q$ be the distinct elements of the set $\{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_q\}$ and $\mu_1 = \mu'_1 < \mu'_2 < \dots < \mu'_{p_2} = \mu_q$ be the distinct elements of $\{\mu_1, \dots, \mu_q\}$, so that $p_1, p_2 \leq q$ and $p_1 + p_2 = p$. By (10.2), provided $\epsilon = \epsilon(n, q), \gamma = \gamma(n, q) \in (0, 1)$ are sufficiently small, we have that $p_1, p_2 \geq 2$.

By the Remark at the end of Section 8, Remark (3) of Section 7 and Theorem 3.4, it follows that if $\epsilon = \epsilon(n, q, \alpha, \tau), \gamma = \gamma(n, q, \alpha, \tau) \in (0, 1)$ are sufficiently small, then

$$(10.4) \quad V \llcorner (\mathbf{R} \times (B_{3/4} \setminus \{|x^2| < \tau\})) = \sum_{j=1}^q |\text{graph } \tilde{u}_j| + |\text{graph } \tilde{w}_j|$$

where $\tilde{u}_j \in C^2(B_{3/4} \setminus \{x^2 > -\tau\})$, $\tilde{w}_j \in C^2(B_{3/4} \setminus \{x^2 < \tau\})$ are functions with small gradient solving the minimal surface equation and with $\tilde{u}_1 \leq \tilde{u}_2 \leq \dots \leq \tilde{u}_q$ and $\tilde{w}_1 \leq \tilde{w}_2 \leq \dots \leq \tilde{w}_q$.

If $p = 4$, then $p_1 = p_2 = 2$ and by (10.2), provided $\epsilon = \epsilon(n, q), \gamma = \gamma(n, q) \in (0, 1)$ are sufficiently small,

$$c\hat{E}_V \leq \max\{|\lambda'_1|, |\lambda'_2|\} \leq c_1 \hat{E}_V, \quad c\hat{E}_V \leq \max\{|\mu'_1|, |\mu'_2|\} \leq c_1 \hat{E}_V \quad \text{and} \\ \min\{|\lambda'_1 - \lambda'_2|, |\mu'_1 - \mu'_2|\} \geq 2c\hat{E}_V$$

where $c_1 = c_1(n), c = c(n, q) \in (0, \infty)$ are as in (10.1) and (10.2). Conclusion (a) follows in this case from Hypothesis 10.1(5) and elliptic estimates.

Now suppose $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C}_q(p)$ for some $p \in \{5, 6, \dots, 2q\}$ and assume by induction the following:

- (A₁) There exist $\tilde{\epsilon} = \tilde{\epsilon}(n, q, \alpha, \tau)$, $\tilde{\gamma} = \tilde{\gamma}(n, q, \alpha, \tau)$ and $\tilde{\beta} = \tilde{\beta}(n, q, \alpha, \tau) \in (0, 1)$ such that if Hypotheses 10.1, Hypothesis (★) and Hypothesis (★★) are satisfied with $M = M_0^4$, $\tilde{\epsilon}, \tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\beta}$ in place of ϵ, γ, β respectively, and with $V \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$ and any cone $\tilde{\mathbf{C}} \in \cup_{k=4}^{p-1} \mathcal{C}_q(k)$ in place of $\mathbf{C}$,

and if the induction hypotheses (H1), (H2) hold, then conclusion (a) with $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}$ in place of $\mathbf{C}$ holds.

By (10.3),

$$(10.5) \quad |\lambda'_{i+1} - \lambda'_i| \geq 2c'Q_V^*(p-1), \quad |\mu'_{j+1} - \mu'_j| \geq 2c'Q_V^*(p-1)$$

for some constant $c' = c'(n, q) \in (0, \infty)$ and all $i = 1, 2, \dots, p_1 - 1$ and $j = 1, 2, \dots, p_2 - 1$. So if

$$(Q_V^*(p-1))^2 \geq \left(\frac{2}{3}\tilde{\beta}\right)^{2q} \tilde{\gamma}\hat{E}_V^2,$$

then it follows from (10.1), (10.4), (10.5) and elliptic estimates that conclusion (a) holds provided $\epsilon = \epsilon(n, q, \alpha, \tau)$, $\gamma = \gamma(n, q, \alpha, \tau) \in (0, 1)$ are sufficiently small. If on the other hand

$$(10.6) \quad (Q_V^*(p-1))^2 < \left(\frac{2}{3}\tilde{\beta}\right)^{2q} \tilde{\gamma}\hat{E}_V^2,$$

then we argue as follows:

Choose $\mathbf{C}_1 \in \cup_{k=1}^{p-1} \mathcal{C}_q(k)$ such that

$$(10.7) \quad Q_V^2(\mathbf{C}_1) \leq \frac{3}{2} (Q_V^*(p-1))^2.$$

If Hypothesis $(\star\star)$ is satisfied with $\mathbf{C}_1$ (as in (10.7)) in place of $\mathbf{C}$ and $\tilde{\beta}$ in place of β , then it follows from assumption (A₁) (taken with $\tilde{\mathbf{C}} = \mathbf{C}_1$), (10.7), Hypothesis $(\star\star)$, (10.5) and elliptic estimates that conclusion (a) holds provided $\epsilon = \epsilon(n, q, \alpha, \tau)$, $\beta = \beta(n, q, \alpha, \tau) \in (0, 1)$ are sufficiently small; if on the other hand Hypothesis $(\star\star)$ is not satisfied with $\mathbf{C}_1$ in place of $\mathbf{C}$ and $\tilde{\beta}$ in place of β , then $q \geq 3$, $p \geq 6$, $\mathbf{C}_1 \in \mathcal{C}_q(k_1)$ for some $k_1 \in \{5, \dots, p-1\}$, and

$$(10.8) \quad Q_V^2(\mathbf{C}_1) \geq \tilde{\beta} (Q_V^*(k_1-1))^2.$$

Choose, in this case, a cone $\mathbf{C}_2 \in \cup_{k=4}^{k_1-1} \mathcal{C}_q(k)$ such that

$$(10.9) \quad Q_V^2(\mathbf{C}_2) \leq \frac{3}{2} (Q_V^*(k_1-1))^2$$

and note that by (10.7), (10.8) and (10.6), we have that

$$(10.10) \quad Q_V^2(\mathbf{C}_2) \leq \tilde{\gamma}\hat{E}_V^2;$$

by (10.7), (10.5) and (10.8), we have that

$$(10.11) \quad |\lambda'_{i+1} - \lambda'_i| \geq \frac{4}{3}c'\tilde{\beta}Q_V^*(k_1-1), \quad |\mu'_{j+1} - \mu'_j| \geq \frac{4}{3}c'\tilde{\beta}Q_V^*(k_1-1)$$

for each $i = 1, 2, \dots, p_1-1$ and $j = 1, 2, \dots, p_2-1$; and since $Q_V^*(p-1) \leq Q_V^*(k_1-1)$, Hypothesis $(\star\star)$ implies that

$$(10.12) \quad Q_V^2(\mathbf{C}) \leq \beta (Q_V^*(k_1))^2.$$

So again, if Hypothesis $(\star\star)$ is satisfied with $\mathbf{C}_2$ in place of $\mathbf{C}$ and $\tilde{\beta}$ in place of β , it follows from (A₁) (taken with $\tilde{\mathbf{C}} = \mathbf{C}_2$), (10.11), (10.12) and elliptic estimates that conclusion (a) holds provided $\epsilon = \epsilon(n, q, \alpha, \tau)$, $\beta = \beta(n, q, \alpha, \tau) \in (0, 1)$ are sufficiently small; if on the other hand Hypothesis $(\star\star)$ is not satisfied with $\mathbf{C}_2$ in place of $\mathbf{C}$ and $\tilde{\beta}$ in place of β , then we may repeat the above argument in the obvious way. It is clear that at most p repetitions of the argument are necessary to reach the desired conclusion.

The rest of the assertions of the theorem follow from the argument, with obvious modifications, of [[Wic04], Lemma 6.20], which in turn is a minor modification of the proof of the corresponding result of [Sim93]. $\square$

Corollary 10.2. *Let q be an integer ≥ 2 , $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, $\tau \in (0, 1/8)$ and $\mu \in (0, 1)$. For each $\rho \in (0, 1/4]$, there exist numbers $\epsilon = \epsilon(n, q, \alpha, \tau, \rho) \in (0, 1)$, $\gamma = \gamma(n, q, \alpha, \tau, \rho) \in (0, 1)$ and $\beta = \beta(n, q, \alpha, \tau, \rho) \in (0, 1)$ such that the following is true: Let $V \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$, $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C}_q$ satisfy Hypotheses 10.1, Hypothesis $(\star)$ with $M = \frac{3}{2}M_0^3$ and Hypothesis $(\star\star)$. Suppose also that the induction hypotheses (H1), (H2) hold. Then for each $Z = (\zeta^1, \zeta^2, \eta) \in \text{spt } \|V\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_{3/8})$ with $\Theta(\|V\|, Z) \geq q$,*

$$\begin{aligned}
(a) \quad & |\zeta^1|^2 + \hat{E}_V^2 |\zeta^2|^2 \leq C \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}\|) d\|V\|(X). \\
(b) \quad & \int_{B_{\rho/2}^{n+1}(Z)} \frac{\text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|T_Z \# \mathbf{C}\|)}{|X - Z|^{n+2-\mu}} d\|V\|(X) \leq \tilde{C} \rho^{-n-2+\mu} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_\rho(\zeta^2, \eta)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}\|) d\|V\|(X)
\end{aligned}$$

where $T_Z : \mathbf{R}^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ is the translation $X \mapsto X - Z$.

$$\begin{aligned}
(c) \quad & \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_{\rho/2}(\zeta^2, \eta) \cap \{x^2 < -\tau\rho\}} \frac{|u_j(x^2, y) - (\zeta^1 - \lambda_j \zeta^2)|^2}{|(u_j(x^2, y), x^2, y) - (\zeta^1, \zeta^2, \eta)|^{n+2-\mu}} dx^2 dy \\
& + \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_{\rho/2}(\zeta^2, \eta) \cap \{x^2 > \tau\rho\}} \frac{|w_j(x^2, y) - (\zeta^1 - \mu_j \zeta^2)|^2}{|(w_j(x^2, y), x^2, y) - (\zeta^1, \zeta^2, \eta)|^{n+2-\mu}} dx^2 dy \\
& \leq \tilde{C} \rho^{-n-2+\mu} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_\rho(\zeta^2, \eta)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}\|) d\|V\|(X).
\end{aligned}$$

Here $C = C(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty)$ and $\tilde{C} = \tilde{C}(n, q, \alpha, \mu) \in (0, \infty)$. (In particular, $C, \tilde{C}$ do not depend on τ, ρ .)

Proof. Let $\epsilon_0 = \epsilon_0(n, q, \alpha, \tau)$, $\gamma_0 = \gamma_0(n, q, \alpha, \tau)$, $\beta_0 = \beta_0(n, q, \alpha, \tau) \in (0, 1)$ be as in Theorem 10.1, and let the hypotheses of the corollary be satisfied for suitably small ϵ, γ, β to be determined depending only on n, q, α and ρ . The proof of the corollary requires application of Theorem 10.1 with $\eta_{Z, \rho} \# V$ in place of V for any $Z = (\zeta^1, \zeta^2, \eta) \in \text{spt } \|V\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_{3/8})$ with $\Theta(\|V\|, Z) \geq q$. Thus we need to show that it is possible to choose ϵ, γ, β depending only on n, q, α, ρ such that if Hypotheses 10.1, Hypothesis $(\star\star)$ are satisfied, and Hypothesis $(\star)$ is satisfied with $M = \frac{3}{2}M_0^3$, and if $Z \in \text{spt } \|V\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_{3/8})$ with $\Theta(\|V\|, Z) \geq q$, then Hypotheses 10.1, Hypothesis $(\star)$ and Hypothesis $(\star\star)$ are satisfied with the varifold $\tilde{V} = \eta_{Z, \rho} \# V$ in place of V , with $\epsilon_0, \gamma_0, \beta_0$ in place of ϵ, γ, β respectively and with $M = \frac{3}{2}M_0^4$. If this is so, then the Corollary follows from the argument of [[Wic04], Lemma 6.21], which in turn is a minor modification of the corresponding argument of [Sim93].

Hypothesis 10.1(1) with $\tilde{V}$ in place of V follows from Lemma 5.1; Hypothesis 10.1(3) with $\tilde{V}$ in place of V and ϵ_0 in place of ϵ holds if $\epsilon < \rho^{n+2}\epsilon_0$. Hypothesis 10.1(4) with $\tilde{V}$ in place of V is satisfied since by the Remark at the end of Section 8, we may choose $\epsilon = \epsilon(n, q, \alpha, \rho)$, $\gamma = \gamma(n, q, \alpha, \rho)$ sufficiently small to ensure $\{Z : \Theta(\|V\|, Z) \geq q\} \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_{1/2}) \subset \{|x^2| < \rho/128\}$.

To verify that Hypotheses 10.1(5) is satisfied with $\tilde{V}$ in place of V and γ_0 in place of γ , we proceed as follows: Note first that by arguing by contradiction, we deduce from Remark (3) of Section 7, Theorem 3.4, the Remark at the end of Section 8 and the bounds (10.1), (10.2) that:

For any given $\delta \in (0, 1)$, there exist $\epsilon = \epsilon(n, q, \alpha, \delta)$, $\gamma = \gamma(n, q, \alpha, \delta) \in (0, 1)$ such that if Hypotheses 10.1 and Hypothesis $(\star)$ with $M = M_0^3$ are satisfied, then

$$(10.13) \quad |\zeta^1|^2 + \hat{E}_V^2 |\zeta^2|^2 < \delta \hat{E}_V^2$$

for each $Z = (\zeta^1, \zeta^2, \eta) \in \text{spt } \|V\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_{3/8})$.

On the other hand, using Theorem 10.1(a) with $\tau = \rho/32$, we note first that for $\epsilon = \epsilon(n, q, \alpha, \rho)$, $\gamma = \gamma(n, q, \alpha, \rho)$, $\beta = \beta(n, q, \alpha, \rho) \in (0, 1)$ sufficiently small,

$$(10.14) \quad \begin{aligned} & \rho^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_\rho(\zeta^2, \eta)} |x^1 - \zeta^1|^2 d\|V\|(X) \geq \\ & \rho^{-n-2} \sum_{j=1}^q \left(\int_{B_\rho(\zeta^2, \eta) \cap \{x^2 < -\rho/16\}} |h_j + u_j - \zeta^1|^2 + \int_{B_\rho(\zeta^2, \eta) \cap \{x^2 > \rho/16\}} |g_j + w_j - \zeta^1|^2 \right) \\ & \geq \frac{1}{2} \rho^{-n-2} \sum_{j=1}^q \left(\int_{B_{\rho/2} \cap \{x^2 < -\rho/16\}} |h_j|^2 + \int_{B_{\rho/2} \cap \{x^2 > \rho/16\}} |g_j|^2 \right) \\ & \quad - \rho^{-n-2} \sum_{j=1}^q \left(\int_{B_\rho(\zeta^2, \eta) \cap \{x^2 < -\rho/16\}} |u_j|^2 + \int_{B_\rho(\zeta^2, \eta) \cap \{x^2 > \rho/16\}} |w_j|^2 \right) - C \rho^{-2} |\zeta^1|^2 \\ & \geq 2^{-n-3} \bar{C}_1 \left(\sum_{j=1}^q |\lambda_j|^2 + |\mu_j|^2 \right) - \rho^{-n-2} E_V^2 - C \rho^{-2} |\zeta^1|^2 \end{aligned}$$

where $E_V^2 = \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}\|) d\|V\|(X)$, $\bar{C}_1 = \bar{C}_1(n) \equiv \int_{B_{1/2} \setminus \{x^2 > 1/16\}} |x^2|^2 d\mathcal{H}^n(x^2, y)$, $C = C(n, q) \in (0, 1)$ and the rest of the notation is as in Theorem 10.1(a). If $\epsilon = \epsilon(n, q, \alpha, \rho)$, $\gamma = \gamma(n, q, \alpha, \rho) \in (0, 1)$ are sufficiently small, it follows from (10.14), (10.2) and (10.13) that $\hat{E}_{\tilde{V}} \geq C \hat{E}_V$, $C = C(n, q) \in (0, \infty)$. Using this, Theorem 10.1(a) and (10.13) again with sufficiently small $\delta = \delta(n, q, \alpha, \tau) \in (0, 1)$, we see that Hypothesis 10.1(5) is satisfied with $\tilde{V}$ in place of V and γ_0 in place of γ , provided $\gamma = \gamma(n, q, \alpha, \tau, \rho) \in (0, 1)$ is sufficiently small.

Now, to verify that Hypothesis $(\star)$ is satisfied with $\tilde{V}$ in place of V and $M = \frac{3}{2} M_0^4$, reasoning again as in (10.14), we see that for any hyperplane P of the form $P = \{x^1 = \lambda x^2\}$, $|\lambda| < 1$,

$$(10.15) \quad \begin{aligned} & \rho^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_\rho(\zeta^2, \eta)} \text{dist}^2(X - Z, P) d\|V\|(X) \geq 2^{-n-4} \bar{C}_1 \left(\sum_{j=1}^q |\lambda_j - \lambda|^2 + |\mu_j - \lambda|^2 \right) \\ & \quad - \frac{1}{2} \rho^{-n-2} E_V^2 - C \rho^{-2} |\zeta^1 - \lambda \zeta^2|^2 \\ & \geq 2^{-n-4} \bar{C}_1 \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}^2(\text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1), P \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1)) - \frac{1}{2} \rho^{-n-2} E_V^2 - C \rho^{-2} |\zeta^1 - \lambda \zeta^2|^2 \\ & \geq 2^{-n-4} \omega_n^{-1} (2q+1)^{-1} \bar{C}_1 \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|V\|(X) \\ & \quad - (2^{-n-3} \omega_n^{-1} (2q+1)^{-1} \bar{C}_1 + 2^{-1} \rho^{-n-2}) E_V^2 - C \rho^{-2} |\zeta^1 - \lambda \zeta^2|^2 \end{aligned}$$

where $C = C(n, q) \in (0, \infty)$ and we have used the triangle inequality in the last step. On the other hand, noting, by the Constancy Theorem, that $(\omega_n(2\rho)^n)^{-1} \|V\|(\mathbf{R} \times B_{2\rho}(0, \eta)) \leq q+1/2$ provided

$\epsilon = \epsilon(n, q, \rho) \in (0, 1)$ is sufficiently small, we see by (10.13) and the triangle inequality again that

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \rho^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_\rho(\zeta^2, \eta)} |x^1 - \zeta^1|^2 d\|V\|(X) \\
 & \leq 2\rho^{-n-2} \|V\|(\mathbf{R} \times B_{2\rho}(0, \eta)) \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}^2(\text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_{2\rho}), \{0\} \times B_{2\rho}) + 2\rho^{-n-2} E_V^2 + C\rho^{-2} \delta \hat{E}_V^2 \\
 (10.16) \quad & \leq (2^{n+2} \omega_n (2q+1) c_1^2 + C\rho^{-2} \delta) \hat{E}_V^2 + 2\rho^{-n-2} E_V^2,
 \end{aligned}$$

where $c_1 = c_1(n)$ is as in (10.1). Since

$$\hat{E}_V^2 \leq \frac{3}{2} M_0^3 \inf_{\{P=\{x^1=\lambda x^2\}\}} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|V\|(X)$$

by hypothesis (of the present Corollary), in view of the fact that

$$\inf_{\{P=\{x^1=\lambda x^2\}\}} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|V\|(X) = \inf_{\{P=\{x^1=\lambda x^2\}, |\lambda| < C\hat{E}_V\}} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|V\|(X)$$

where $C = C(n) \in (0, \infty)$, we deduce from (10.13), (10.15) and (10.16) that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \hat{E}_V^2 & \leq \frac{(2^{2n+6} \omega_n^2 (2q+1)^2 c_1^2 + 2^{n+4} \omega_n (2q+1) (2\rho^{-n-2} \gamma + C\rho^{-2} \delta)) \frac{3}{2} M_0^3}{\bar{C}_1 - 2^{n+4} \omega_n (2q+1) ((2^{-1} \rho^{-n-2} + 2^{-n-3} \omega_n^{-1} (2q+1)^{-1} \bar{C}_1) \gamma + C\rho^{-2} \delta) \frac{3}{2} M_0^3} \times \\
 & \quad \times \inf_{\{P=\{x^1=\lambda x^2\}\}} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|\tilde{V}\|(X) \\
 & \leq \frac{3}{2} M_0^4 \inf_{\{P=\{x^1=\lambda x^2\}\}} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|\tilde{V}\|(X)
 \end{aligned}$$

provided $\epsilon = \epsilon(n, q, \alpha, \rho)$, $\gamma = \gamma(n, q, \alpha, \rho) \in (0, 1)$ are sufficiently small.

It only remains to verify that Hypothesis $(\star\star)$ is satisfied with $\tilde{V}$ in place of V and β_0 in place of β . So assume $q \geq 3$, $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C}_q(p)$ for some $p \in \{5, \dots, 2q\}$ (else $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C}_q(4)$ and there is nothing further to prove). For any $\mathbf{C}' \in \cup_{k=4}^{p-1} \mathcal{C}_q(k)$, we have by the definition of $Q_V^*(p-1)$, the triangle inequality and Hypothesis $(\star\star)$ that

$$\text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}^2(\text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}'\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1), \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1)) \geq C(Q_V^*(p-1))^2, \quad C = C(n, q) \in (0, \infty),$$

and hence by Theorem 10.1(a), for sufficiently small $\epsilon = \epsilon(n, q, \alpha, \rho)$, $\gamma = \gamma(n, q, \alpha, \rho)$, $\beta = \beta(n, q, \alpha, \rho) \in (0, 1)$, that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}'\|) d\|\tilde{V}\|(X) \\
& \geq \sum_{j=1}^q \rho^{-n-2} \int_{B_\rho(\zeta^2, \eta) \setminus \{x^2 < -\rho/16\}} \text{dist}^2((h^j(x^2, y) + u^j(x^2, y), x^2, y) - Z, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}'\|) d\mathcal{H}^n(x^2, y) \\
& \quad + \sum_{j=1}^q \rho^{-n-2} \int_{B_\rho(\zeta^2, \eta) \setminus \{x^2 > \rho/16\}} \text{dist}^2((g^j(x^2, y) + w^j(x^2, y), x^2, y) - Z, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}'\|) d\mathcal{H}^n(x^2, y) \\
& \geq \sum_{j=1}^q \rho^{-n-2} \int_{B_{\rho/2}(0, \eta) \setminus \{x^2 < -\rho/16\}} \text{dist}^2((h^j(x^2, y) + u^j(x^2, y), x^2, y), \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}'\|) d\mathcal{H}^n(x^2, y) \\
& \quad + \sum_{j=1}^q \rho^{-n-2} \int_{B_{\rho/2}(0, \eta) \setminus \{x^2 > \rho/16\}} \text{dist}^2((g^j(x^2, y) + w^j(x^2, y), x^2, y), \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}'\|) d\mathcal{H}^n(x^2, y) \\
& \quad - C' \rho^{-2} (|\zeta^1|^2 + \delta(\mathbf{C}') |\zeta^2|^2) \\
& \geq C (Q_V^*(p))^2 - \rho^{-n-2} E_V^2 - C' \rho^{-2} (|\zeta^1|^2 + \delta(\mathbf{C}') |\zeta^2|^2) \\
(10.17) \quad & \geq \frac{1}{2} C (Q_V^*(p-1))^2 - C' \rho^{-2} (|\zeta^1|^2 + \delta(\mathbf{C}') |\zeta^2|^2)
\end{aligned}$$

where $C = C(n, q)$, $C' = C'(n, q) \in (0, \infty)$ and $\delta(\mathbf{C}') = \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}^2(\text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}'\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1), \{0\} \times B_1)$. Since $\hat{E}_V^2 \leq C \rho^{-n-2} \hat{E}_V^2$ where $C = C(n, q) \in (0, \infty)$, we have that

$$Q_V^*(p-1) = \inf_{\{\mathbf{C}' \in \cup_{k=4}^{p-1} \mathcal{C}_q(k) : \delta(\mathbf{C}') < C \rho^{-n-2} \hat{E}_V^2\}} Q_{\tilde{V}}(\mathbf{C}'),$$

so it follows from (10.17) that

$$(10.18) \quad \left(Q_V^*(p-1)\right)^2 \geq C (Q_V^*(p-1))^2 - C' \rho^{-n-4} (|\zeta^1|^2 + \hat{E}_V^2 |\zeta^2|^2)$$

where $C = C(n, q)$, $C' = C'(n, q) \in (0, \infty)$. On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}
(10.19) \quad Q_V^2(\mathbf{C}) & \leq \rho^{-n-2} Q_V^2(\mathbf{C}) + C \rho^{-2} (|\zeta^1|^2 + \hat{E}_V^2 |\zeta^2|^2) \\
& \leq \beta \rho^{-n-2} (Q_V^*(p-1))^2 + C_1 \rho^{-2} (|\zeta^1|^2 + \hat{E}_V^2 |\zeta^2|^2)
\end{aligned}$$

where $C_1 = C_1(n, q) \in (0, \infty)$. Thus, the assertion that the hypotheses of the corollary (with sufficiently small $\epsilon = \epsilon(n, q, \alpha, \rho)$, $\gamma = \gamma(n, q, \alpha, \rho)$, $\beta = \beta(n, q, \alpha, \rho) \in (0, 1)$) imply Hypothesis $(\star\star)$ with $\tilde{V}$, β_0 in place of V , β will be established by Claim 1 below, taken with any $\delta = \delta(n, q, \alpha, \rho) \in (0, 1)$ satisfying $\max\{C', \beta_0^{-1} C_1\} \rho^{-n-4} \delta < C/2$, where C, C', C_1 are as in (10.18) and (10.19).

Claim 1: Suppose that $q \geq 3$. For any given $\delta \in (0, 1)$, there exist $\epsilon = \epsilon(n, q, \alpha, \delta)$, $\gamma = \gamma(n, q, \alpha, \delta)$, $\beta = \beta(n, q, \alpha, \delta) \in (0, 1)$ such that if Hypotheses 10.1, Hypothesis $(\star)$ with $M = M_0^3$ and Hypothesis $(\star\star)$ are satisfied with $V \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$, $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C}_q(p)$ for some $p \in \{5, \dots, 2q\}$, then

$$(10.20) \quad |\zeta^1|^2 + \hat{E}_V^2 |\zeta^2|^2 \leq \delta (Q_V^*(p-1))^2$$

for each $Z = (\zeta^1, \zeta^2, \eta) \in \text{spt } \|V\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_{3/8})$ with $\Theta(\|V\|, Z) \geq q$.

To prove Claim 1, we first need the following:

Claim 2: Suppose that $q \geq 3$ and let $\delta \in (0, 1)$, $\theta \in (0, 1)$. There exist $\tilde{\epsilon} = \tilde{\epsilon}(n, q, \alpha, \delta, \theta)$, $\tilde{\gamma}_1 = \tilde{\gamma}_1(n, q, \alpha, \delta, \theta)$, $\tilde{\beta} = \tilde{\beta}(n, q, \alpha, \delta, \theta) \in (0, 1)$ such that if $p \in \{5, \dots, 2q\}$, $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C}_q(p)$, $V \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$; Hypotheses 10.1(1)-(4) hold with $\tilde{\epsilon}$ in place of ϵ ; Hypothesis $(\star)$ holds with $M = M_0^3$; Hypothesis $(\star\star)$

holds with $\tilde{\beta}$ in place of β ; and if $(Q_V^*(4))^2 < \tilde{\gamma} \hat{E}_V^2$ and $(Q_V^*(p-1))^2 \geq \theta (Q_V^*(4))^2$, then

$$|\zeta_1|^2 + \hat{E}_V^2 |\zeta_2|^2 < \delta (Q_V^*(p-1))^2$$

for each $Z = (\zeta^1, \zeta^2, \eta) \in \text{spt} \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_{3/8})$ with $\Theta(\|V\|, Z) \geq q$.

Proof of Claim 2: Note first that our argument so far establishes the present Corollary in the special case when $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C}_q(4)$. Taking in particular $\rho = 1/4$ in the argument so far, we have shown that there exist $\epsilon'' = \epsilon''(n, q, \alpha)$, $\gamma'' = \gamma''(n, q, \alpha)$ such that if Hypotheses 10.1, Hypothesis $(\star)$ hold with ϵ'' , γ'' in place of ϵ , γ ; with $M = M_0^3$; with $V \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$ and with $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C}_q(4)$, then for each $Z \in \text{spt} \|V\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_{3/8})$ with $\Theta(\|V\|, Z) \geq q$, Hypotheses 10.1, Hypothesis $(\star)$ and Hypothesis $(\star\star)$ hold with $\tilde{V} (= \eta_{Z, 1/4} \# V)$ in place of V ; with $M = M_0^4$ and with ϵ_0 , γ_0 in place of ϵ , γ ; so by arguing as in [[Wic04], Lemma 6.21], we may, in this special case (viz. when $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C}_q(4)$), complete the proof of the Corollary, and in particular obtain (by parts (a) and (c)) that for each $\tau \in (0, 1/8)$, if Hypotheses 10.1, Hypothesis $(\star)$ and Hypothesis $(\star\star)$ are satisfied with sufficiently small $\epsilon'' = \epsilon''(n, q, \alpha, \tau)$, $\gamma'' = \gamma''(n, q, \alpha, \tau) \in (0, 1)$ in place of ϵ , γ , and with $V \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$, $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C}_q(4)$, then for each $Z = (\zeta^1, \zeta^2, \eta) \in \text{spt} \|V\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_{3/8})$ with $\Theta(\|V\|, Z) \geq q$ and $\mu \in (0, 1)$, we have that

$$(10.21) \quad |\zeta^1|^2 + \hat{E}_V^2 |\zeta^2|^2 \leq C E_V^2 \quad \text{and}$$

$$(10.22) \quad \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_{1/8}(\zeta^2, \eta) \cap \{x^2 < -\tau/4\}} \frac{|u_j(x^2, y) - (\zeta^1 - \lambda_j \zeta^2)|^2}{|(u_j(x^2, y), x^2, y) - (\zeta^1, \zeta^2, \eta)|^{n+2-\mu}} dx^2 dy \\ + \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_{1/8}(\zeta^2, \eta) \cap \{x^2 > \tau/4\}} \frac{|w_j(x^2, y) - (\zeta^1 - \mu_j \zeta^2)|^2}{|(w_j(x^2, y), x^2, y) - (\zeta^1, \zeta^2, \eta)|^{n+2-\mu}} dx^2 dy \leq \tilde{C} E_V^2$$

where $C = C(n, q, \alpha)$, $\tilde{C} = \tilde{C}(n, q, \alpha, \mu) \in (0, \infty)$, $E_V^2 = \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt} \|\mathbf{C}\|) d\|V\|(X)$ and we have used the notation of Theorem 10.1(a).

Now, for each $k = 1, 2, \dots$, let $\tau_k \in (0, 1/8)$ be such that $\tau_k \searrow 0^+$. Suppose that Claim 2 is false. Then there exist numbers $\delta, \theta \in (0, 1)$, an integer $p \in \{5, \dots, 2q\}$, and for each $k = 1, 2, \dots$, a varifold $V_k \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$, a point $Z_k = (\zeta_k^1, \zeta_k^2, \eta_k) \in \text{spt} \|V_k\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_{3/8})$ with $\Theta(\|V_k\|, Z_k) \geq q$, a cone $\mathbf{C}_k \in \mathcal{C}_q(p)$ such that Hypotheses 10.1(1), Hypotheses 10.1(2), Hypotheses 10.1(4), Hypothesis $(\star)$ are satisfied with V_k in place of V , $\mathbf{C}_k$ in place of $\mathbf{C}$, $M = M_0^3$ and with $\hat{E}_k \rightarrow 0$,

$$(10.23) \quad (Q_k^*(p-1))^{-2} Q_{V_k}(\mathbf{C}_k) \rightarrow 0,$$

$$\hat{E}_k^{-1} Q_k^*(4) \rightarrow 0,$$

$$(10.24) \quad (Q_k^*(p-1))^2 \geq \theta (Q_k^*(4))^2 \quad \text{and yet}$$

$$(10.25) \quad |\zeta_k^1|^2 + \hat{E}_k^2 |\zeta_k^2|^2 \geq \delta (Q_k^*(p-1))^2,$$

where we have used the notation $\hat{E}_k = \hat{E}_{V_k}$, $Q_k^*(4) = Q_{V_k}^*(4)$ and $Q_k^*(p-1) = Q_{V_k}^*(p-1)$.

For each $k = 1, 2, \dots$, choose $\overline{\mathbf{C}}_k \in \mathcal{C}_q(4)$ such that $(Q_{V_k}(\overline{\mathbf{C}}_k))^2 < \frac{3}{2} (Q_{V_k}^*(4))^2$. By passing to appropriate subsequences without changing notation, we have by (10.21) and (10.22) that for each $k = 1, 2, \dots$,

$$(10.26) \quad |\zeta_k^1|^2 + \hat{E}_k^2 |\zeta_k^2|^2 \leq C E_k^2$$

where $C = C(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty)$, and for each $\mu \in (0, 1)$,

$$(10.27) \quad \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_{1/8}(\zeta_k^2, \eta_k) \cap \{x^2 < -\tau_k/4\}} \frac{|u_j^k(x^2, y) - (\zeta_k^1 - \bar{\lambda}_j^k \zeta_k^2)|^2}{|(u_j^k(x^2, y), x^2, y) - (\zeta_k^1, \zeta_k^2, \eta_k)|^{n+2-\mu}} dx^2 dy \\ + \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_{1/8}(\zeta_k^2, \eta_k) \cap \{x^2 > \tau_k/4\}} \frac{|w_j^k(x^2, y) - (\zeta_k^1 - \bar{\mu}_j^k \zeta_k^2)|^2}{|(w_j^k(x^2, y), x^2, y) - (\zeta_k^1, \zeta_k^2, \eta_k)|^{n+2-\mu}} dx^2 dy \leq \tilde{C} E_k^2$$

where $\tilde{C} = \tilde{C}(n, q, \alpha, \mu) \in (0, \infty)$. Here, $E_k^2 = \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt} \|\bar{\mathbf{C}}_k\|) d\|V_k\|(X)$; for each $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, q\}$ and $k = 1, 2, \dots$, the functions u_j^k, w_j^k correspond to u_j, w_j of Theorem 10.1(a) when $V_k, \bar{\mathbf{C}}_k$ are taken in place of $V, \mathbf{C}$, and the numbers $\bar{\lambda}_j^k, \bar{\mu}_j^k$ correspond to λ_j, μ_j of Hypothesis 10.1(2) when $\bar{\mathbf{C}}_k$ is taken in place of $\mathbf{C}$. Thus $\bar{\lambda}_1^k \geq \bar{\lambda}_2^k \geq \dots \geq \bar{\lambda}_q^k, \bar{\mu}_1^k \leq \bar{\mu}_2^k \leq \dots \leq \bar{\mu}_q^k$ and by (10.1) and (10.2),

$$(10.28) \quad c\hat{E}_k \leq \max\{|\bar{\lambda}_1^k|, |\bar{\lambda}_q^k|\} \leq c_1 \hat{E}_k, \quad c\hat{E}_k \leq \max\{|\bar{\mu}_1^k|, |\bar{\mu}_q^k|\} \leq c_1 \hat{E}_k$$

where $c_1 = c_1(n), c = c(n, q) \in (0, \infty)$ are as in (10.1) and (10.2).

Writing $Q_k = Q_{V_k}(\bar{\mathbf{C}}_k)$, we see by Theorem 10.1(a) and elliptic estimates that for each $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, q\}$, there exist harmonic functions $\varphi_j : B_{1/2} \cap \{x^2 < 0\} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}, \psi_j : B_{1/2} \cap \{x^2 > 0\} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ such that $Q_k^{-1}u_j^k \rightarrow \varphi_j, Q_k^{-1}w_j^k \rightarrow \psi_j$ where the convergence is in $C^2(K)$ for each compact subset K of the respective domains. By (10.23), $Q_k^{-1}Q_k(\mathbf{C}_k) \rightarrow 0$, which implies that $\varphi_j(x^2, y) = \bar{\lambda}_j x^2$ for $(x^2, y) \in B_{1/2} \cap \{x^2 < 0\}, \psi_j(x^2, y) = \bar{\mu}_j x^2$ for $(x^2, y) \in B_{1/2} \cap \{x^2 > 0\}$, where $\bar{\lambda}_j, \bar{\mu}_j$ are constants. We find a point $\eta \in \{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1}$ and, by (10.26) and (10.28), numbers $\kappa_1, \kappa_2, \ell_1, \dots, \ell_q, m_1, \dots, m_q$ such that, passing to further subsequences without changing notation, $\eta_k \rightarrow \eta, Q_k^{-1}\zeta_k^1 \rightarrow \kappa_1, Q_k^{-1}\hat{E}_k\zeta_k^2 \rightarrow \kappa_2, \hat{E}_k^{-1}\lambda_j^k \rightarrow \ell_j$ and $\hat{E}_k^{-1}\mu_j^k \rightarrow m_j$. We deduce from (10.27) that

$$\sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_{1/8}(0, \eta) \cap \{x^2 < 0\}} \frac{|\bar{\lambda}_j x^2 - (\kappa_1 - \ell_j \kappa_2)|}{(|x^2|^2 + |y - \eta|^2)^{\frac{n+2-\mu}{2}}} dx^2 dy \\ + \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_{1/8}(0, \eta) \cap \{x^2 > 0\}} \frac{|\bar{\mu}_j x^2 - (\kappa_1 - m_j \kappa_2)|}{(|x^2|^2 + |y - \eta|^2)^{\frac{n+2-\mu}{2}}} dx^2 dy < \infty$$

which readily implies that $\kappa_1 - \ell_j \kappa_2 = 0$ and $\kappa_1 - m_j \kappa_2 = 0$ for each $j = 1, 2, \dots, q$. Since by (10.28) at least one of $\ell_1, \dots, \ell_q$ is non-zero, we must have that $\kappa_1 = \kappa_2 = 0$. This however contradicts (10.25), establishing Claim 2.

Note that case $p = 5$ of Claim 1 follows from Claim 2 with $p = 5$ and $\theta = 1$. To see the general case of Claim 1, suppose that $q \geq 3$, fix any $p \in \{6, \dots, 2q\}$ and assume by induction that:

- (A₂) Claim 1 with any $p' \in \{5, \dots, p-1\}$ in place of p is true; i.e. if $q \geq 3$, then for each $\delta \in (0, 1)$, there exist $\epsilon' = \epsilon'(n, q, \alpha, \delta), \gamma' = \gamma'(n, q, \alpha, \delta), \beta' = \beta'(n, q, \alpha, \delta) \in (0, 1)$ such that whenever $p' \in \{5, \dots, p-1\}$ and Hypotheses 10.1, Hypothesis (*), Hypothesis (**) are satisfied with $V \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha, \mathbf{C}' \in \mathcal{C}_q(p')$ in place of $\mathbf{C}, M = \frac{3}{2}M_0^3$ and with $\epsilon', \gamma', \beta'$ in place of ϵ, γ, β respectively, it follows that

$$|\zeta^1|^2 + \hat{E}_V^2 |\zeta^2|^2 \leq \delta (Q_V^*(p' - 1))^2$$

for each $Z = (\zeta^1, \zeta^2, \eta) \in \text{spt} \|V\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_{3/8})$ such that $\Theta(\|V\|, Z) \geq q$.

Let $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C}_q(p)$, $V \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$, $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and suppose that Hypotheses 10.1, Hypothesis $(\star)$ and Hypothesis $(\star\star)$ are satisfied with $M = \frac{3}{2}M_0^3$ and with ϵ, γ, β to be determined depending only on n, q, α and δ . Let $\epsilon', \gamma', \beta'$ be as in (A_2) . To establish Claim 1, we need one further fact:

Claim 3: Suppose that $q \geq 3$ and let $\delta \in (0, 1)$. There exist $\tilde{\epsilon}_1 = \tilde{\epsilon}_1(n, q, \alpha, \delta), \tilde{\gamma}_1 = \tilde{\gamma}_1(n, q, \alpha, \delta), \tilde{\beta}_1 = \tilde{\beta}_1(n, q, \alpha, \delta), \gamma_1 = \gamma_1(n, q, \alpha, \delta), \beta_1 = \beta_1(n, q, \alpha, \delta) \in (0, 1)$ such that if $p \in \{6, \dots, 2q\}$, (A_2) holds, Hypotheses 10.1, Hypothesis $(\star)$, Hypothesis $(\star\star)$ are satisfied with $V \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$, $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C}_q(p)$, $M = M_0^3$ and with $\tilde{\epsilon}_1, \tilde{\gamma}_1, \tilde{\beta}_1$ in place of ϵ, β, γ respectively, and if $(Q_V^*(p-1))^2 < \gamma_1 \hat{E}_V^2$ and $(Q_V^*(p-1))^2 < \beta_1 (Q_V^*(p-2))^2$, then

$$|\zeta_1|^2 + \hat{E}_V^2 |\zeta_2|^2 < \delta (Q_V^*(p-1))^2$$

for each $Z = (\zeta^1, \zeta^2, \eta) \in \text{spt} \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_{3/8})$ with $\Theta(\|V\|, Z) \geq q$.

Proof of Claim 3: Argue by contradiction in a manner completely analogous to the proof of Claim 2. Thus we need to blow up an appropriate sequence $\{V_k\} \subset \mathcal{S}_\alpha$ relative to a sequence of cones $\{\overline{\mathbf{C}}_k\}$ with $\overline{\mathbf{C}}_k \in \mathcal{C}_q(m)$ for some $m \in \{4, \dots, p-1\}$, chosen such that $(Q_{V_k}(\overline{\mathbf{C}}_k))^2 < \frac{3}{2} (Q_{V_k}^*(p-1))^2$. To establish, in this case, the key estimates corresponding to (10.26) and (10.27), we only need to observe the following: We may complete the proof of the present Corollary (with $\rho = 1/4$) in case $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C}_q(m)$ for some $m \in \{4, \dots, p-1\}$ by arguing as in [[Wic04], Lemma 6.21], with the help of the induction assumption (A_2) and the part of the proof of the present Corollary up to the estimate (10.19).

With the help of Claim 2 and Claim 3, we can now show that (A_2) implies Claim 1.

Proof of Claim 1: As pointed out before, case $p = 5$ of Claim 1 follows from Claim 2. Suppose that $q \geq 3$, let $p \in \{6, \dots, 2q\}$ and assume by induction the validity of (A_2) . Let $\delta \in (0, 1)$, and $\gamma_1 = \gamma_1(n, q, \alpha, \delta), \beta_1 = \beta_1(n, q, \alpha, \delta)$ be as in Claim 3. Define constants $\beta_2, \dots, \beta_{2q}$ (depending only on n, q, α, δ) recursively by setting

$$\beta_j = \frac{2}{3}\beta' \left(n, q, \alpha, \left(\frac{2}{3} \right)^{j-1} \delta \Pi_{k=1}^{j-1} \beta_k \right)$$

for $j \in \{2, \dots, 2q\}$, and constants $\gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_{2q}$ (also depending only on n, q, α, δ) by

$$\gamma_j = \gamma' \left(n, q, \alpha, \left(\frac{2}{3} \right)^{j-1} \delta \Pi_{k=1}^{j-1} \beta_{j-1} \right)$$

for $j \in \{2, \dots, 2q\}$, where γ', β' are as in (A_2) . Set $\overline{\beta} = \Pi_{j=1}^{2q} \beta_j$ and $\overline{\gamma} = \Pi_{j=1}^{2q} \gamma_j$. Let $\overline{\gamma}_1 = \tilde{\gamma}(n, q, \alpha, \delta, \overline{\beta})$ where $\tilde{\gamma}$ is as in Claim 2.

Let $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C}_q(p)$ and $V \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$. Consider the following exhaustive list of alternatives:

(a) $(Q_V^*(p-1))^2 \geq \frac{2}{3} \overline{\beta} \overline{\gamma} \overline{\gamma}_1 \hat{E}_V^2$.

(b₁) $(Q_V^*(p-1))^2 < \frac{2}{3} \overline{\beta} \overline{\gamma} \overline{\gamma}_1 \hat{E}_V^2$ and $(Q_V^*(p-1))^2 < \beta_1 (Q_V^*(p-2))^2$.

(b₂) $q \geq 4, p \in \{7, \dots, 2q\}, (Q_V^*(p-1))^2 < \frac{2}{3} \overline{\beta} \overline{\gamma} \overline{\gamma}_1 \hat{E}_V^2, (Q_V^*(p-1))^2 \geq \beta_1 (Q_V^*(p-2))^2$ and $(Q_V^*(p-2))^2 < \beta_2 (Q_V^*(p-3))^2$.

(b₃) $q \geq 4, p \in \{8, \dots, 2q\}, (Q_V^*(p-1))^2 < \frac{2}{3} \overline{\beta} \overline{\gamma} \overline{\gamma}_1 \hat{E}_V^2, (Q_V^*(p-1))^2 \geq \beta_1 (Q_V^*(p-2))^2, (Q_V^*(p-2))^2 \geq \beta_2 (Q_V^*(p-3))^2$ and $(Q_V^*(p-3))^2 < \beta_3 (Q_V^*(p-4))^2$.

...

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathbf{b}_{p-5}) \quad & (Q_V^*(p-1))^2 < \frac{2}{3}\overline{\beta}\overline{\gamma}\overline{\gamma}_1\hat{E}_V^2, (Q_V^*(p-1))^2 \geq \beta_1(Q_V^*(p-2))^2, (Q_V^*(p-2))^2 \geq \beta_2(Q_V^*(p-3))^2, \\
& (Q_V^*(p-3))^2 \geq \beta_3(Q_V^*(p-4))^2, \dots, (Q_V^*(6))^2 \geq \beta_{p-6}(Q_V^*(5))^2 \text{ and } (Q_V^*(5))^2 < \beta_{p-5}(Q_V^*(4))^2. \\
(\mathbf{c}) \quad & (Q_V^*(p-1))^2 < \frac{2}{3}\overline{\beta}\overline{\gamma}\overline{\gamma}_1\hat{E}_V^2, (Q_V^*(p-1))^2 \geq \beta_1(Q_V^*(p-2))^2, (Q_V^*(p-2))^2 \geq \beta_2(Q_V^*(p-3))^2, \\
& (Q_V^*(p-3))^2 \geq \beta_3(Q_V^*(p-4))^2, \dots, (Q_V^*(6))^2 \geq \beta_{p-6}(Q_V^*(5))^2 \text{ and } (Q_V^*(5))^2 \geq \beta_{p-5}(Q_V^*(4))^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Claim 1 in case alternative (a) holds follows from the assertion (10.13); Claim 1 in case alternative (b₁) holds follows from Claim 3; Claim 1 in case alternative (b₂) holds follows from the induction assumption (A₂) applied with $\mathbf{C}' \in \cup_{k=4}^{p-2} \mathcal{C}_q(k)$ chosen such that $Q_V^2(\mathbf{C}') < \frac{3}{2}(Q_V^*(p-2))^2$ and with $\frac{2}{3}\delta\beta_1(n, q, \alpha, \delta)$ in place of δ ; similarly, Claim 1 in case of any of the alternatives (b₃)-(b_{p-5}) holds follows from an application of (A₂); Claim 1 in case alternative (c) holds follows from Claim 2 applied with $\theta = \overline{\beta}$. Thus the inductive poof of Claim 1 is complete.

We may now complete the proof of the Corollary by arguing as in [[Wic04], Lemma 6.21]. $\square$

Remark: Note that the proof of Corollary 10.2 establishes that corresponding to each $\epsilon, \gamma, \beta \in (0, 1/2)$ and $\rho \in (0, 1/2)$, there exist $\tilde{\epsilon} = \tilde{\epsilon}(n, q, \alpha, \rho, \epsilon) \in (0, 1/2)$, $\tilde{\gamma} = \tilde{\gamma}(n, q, \alpha, \rho, \gamma) \in (0, 1/2)$, $\tilde{\beta} = \tilde{\beta}(n, q, \alpha, \rho, \beta) \in (0, 1/2)$ such that the following is true: Let $V \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$ and $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C}_q$. If Hypotheses 10.1 are satisfied with $\tilde{\epsilon}, \tilde{\gamma}$ in place of ϵ, γ respectively, Hypothesis $(\star)$ is satisfied with $M = \frac{3}{2}M_0^2$ and Hypothesis $(\star\star)$ is satisfied with $\tilde{\beta}$ in place of β , and if the induction hypotheses (H1), (H2) hold, then, for each $Z \in \text{spt } \|V\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_{3/8})$, Hypotheses 10.1, Hypothesis $(\star)$ with $M = \frac{3}{2}M_0^3$ and Hypothesis $(\star\star)$ are satisfied with $\eta_{Z, \rho} \# V$ in place of V .

Lemma 10.3. *Let q be an integer ≥ 2 , $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, $\delta \in (0, 1/8)$ and $\mu \in (0, 1)$. There exist numbers $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_1(n, q, \alpha, \delta) \in (0, 1)$, $\gamma_1 = \gamma_1(n, q, \alpha, \delta) \in (0, 1)$ and $\beta_1 = \beta_1(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, 1)$ such that the following is true: If $V \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$, $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C}_q$ satisfy Hypotheses 10.1, Hypothesis $(\star)$ with ϵ_1, γ_1 in place of ϵ, γ respectively and with $M = \frac{3}{2}M_0^4$, and if the induction hypotheses (H1), (H2) hold, then*

$$(a) \quad B_\delta^{n+1}(0, y) \cap \{Z : \Theta(\|V\|, Z) \geq q\} \neq \emptyset \text{ for each point } (0, y) \in \{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1} \cap B_{1/2}.$$

(b) *If additionally $V, \mathbf{C}$ satisfy Hypothesis $(\star\star)$ with β_1 in place of β , then*

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{B_{1/2}^{n+1}(0) \cap \{(x^1, x^2) : |x^1| < \sigma\}} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}\|) d\|V\|(X) \\
& \leq C_1 \sigma^{1-\mu} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}\|) d\|V\|(X)
\end{aligned}$$

for each $\sigma \in [\delta, 1/4)$, where $C_1 = C_1(n, q, \alpha, \mu) \in (0, \infty)$. (In particular C_1 is independent of δ and σ .)

Proof. If part (a) were false, then there exist a number $\delta \in (0, 1/2)$ and a sequence of varifolds $\{V_k\} \subset \mathcal{S}_\alpha$; a sequence of cones $\mathbf{C}_k = \sum_{j=1}^q |H_j^k| + |G_j^k| \in \mathcal{C}_q$ where, for each k , $H_j^k = \{(x^1, x^2, y) \in \mathbf{R}^{n+1} : x^2 < 0 \text{ and } x^1 = \lambda_j^k x^2\}$, $G_j^k = \{(x^1, x^2, y) \in \mathbf{R}^{n+1} : x^2 > 0 \text{ and } x^1 = \mu_j^k x^2\}$, with $\lambda_1^k \geq \lambda_2^k \geq \dots \geq \lambda_q^k$ and $\mu_1^k \leq \mu_2^k \leq \dots \leq \mu_q^k$; and a sequence of points $(0, y_k) \in \{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1} \cap B_{1/2}$ with $B_\delta^{n+1}(0, y_k) \cap \{Z : \Theta(\|V_k\|, Z) \geq q\} = \emptyset$ such that Hypotheses 10.1 (1), (2), (4) are satisfied with $V_k, \mathbf{C}_k$ in place of $V, \mathbf{C}$; Hypothesis $(\star)$ is satisfied with $M = \frac{3}{2}M_0^4$ and V_k in place of V ;

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{E}_k = \hat{E}_{V_k} &\equiv \sqrt{\int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} |x^1|^2 d\|V_k\|(X)} \rightarrow 0 \text{ and} \\
&\hat{E}_k^{-2} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times (B_{1/2} \setminus \{|x^2| < 1/16\})} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|V_k\|) d\|\mathbf{C}_k\|(X) \\
(10.29) \quad &+ \hat{E}_k^{-2} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}_k\|) d\|V_k\|(X) \rightarrow 0.
\end{aligned}$$

After passing to a subsequence without changing notation, $(0, y_k) \rightarrow (0, y)$ for some point $(0, y) \in \{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1} \cap \overline{B}_{1/2}$, and hence

$$B_{\delta/2}^{n+1}(0, y) \cap \{Z : \Theta(\|V_k\|, Z) \geq q\} = \emptyset$$

for all sufficiently large k . This implies, by Remark 3 of Section 7, that for all sufficiently large k , $\mathcal{H}^{n-7+\gamma}(\text{sing } V_k \llcorner (B_{\delta/2}^{n+1}(0, y))) = 0$ for each $\gamma > 0$ if $n \geq 7$, and $\text{sing } V_k \llcorner (B_{\delta/2}^{n+1}(0, y)) = \emptyset$ if $2 \leq n \leq 6$, so by Theorem 3.4 and elliptic theory,

$$(10.30) \quad V_k \llcorner (\mathbf{R} \times B_{\delta/4}((0, y))) = \sum_{j=1}^q |\text{graph } u_j^k|$$

for all sufficiently large k , where $v_j^k \in C^\infty(B_{\delta/4}(0, y))$, $u_1^k \leq u_2^k \leq \dots \leq u_q^k$ on $B_{\delta/4}((0, y))$ and u_j^k are solutions of the minimal surface equation on $B_{\delta/4}((0, y))$ satisfying, by standard elliptic estimates,

$$\sup_{B_{\delta/16}(0, y)} |D^\ell u_j^k| \leq C \hat{E}_k$$

for $\ell = 0, 1, 2, 3$ and $j = 1, 2, \dots, q$, where $C = C(n, \delta)$. Passing to a further subsequence without changing notation, we deduce that for each $j = 1, 2, \dots, q$, $\hat{E}_k^{-1} u_j^k \rightarrow v_j$ in $C^2(B_{\delta/16}(0, y))$ where v_j are harmonic in $B_{\delta/16}(0, y)$ with $v_1 \leq v_2 \leq \dots \leq v_q$ on $B_{\delta/16}(0, y)$. By (10.29), we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
v_j|_{B_{\delta/16}(0, y) \cap \{x^2 < 0\}} &= \tilde{h}_j|_{B_{\delta/16}(0, y) \cap \{x^2 < 0\}} \quad \text{and} \\
v_j|_{B_{\delta/16}(0, y) \cap \{x^2 > 0\}} &= \tilde{g}_j|_{B_{\delta/16}(0, y) \cap \{x^2 > 0\}}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{h}_j$ and $\tilde{g}_j$ are linear functions of the form $\tilde{h}_j(x^2, y) = \tilde{\lambda}_j x^2$, $\tilde{g}_j(x^2, y) = \tilde{\mu}_j x^2$, with $\tilde{\lambda}_j, \tilde{\mu}_j \in \mathbf{R}$, $\tilde{\lambda}_1 \geq \tilde{\lambda}_2 \geq \dots \geq \tilde{\lambda}_q$ and $\tilde{\mu}_1 \leq \tilde{\mu}_2 \leq \dots \leq \tilde{\mu}_q$. By the maximum principle, we conclude that $\tilde{\lambda}_j = \tilde{\mu}_j = \lambda$ for some $\lambda \in \mathbf{R}$ and all $j = 1, 2, \dots, q$. Therefore, by (10.29) again, we see that the coarse blow-up (in the sense of Section 5) of $\{V_k\}$ and that of $\{\mathbf{C}_k\}$, are both equal to the hyperplane $x^1 = \lambda x^2$. But this is impossible in view of (10.2) so the assertion of part (a) must hold.

To see part (b), argue as in [[Sim93], Corollary 3.2 (ii)], using the fact that for any $X \in \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$,

$$|\text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}\|) - \text{dist}(X, \text{spt } \|T_Z \# \mathbf{C}\|)| \leq \max_{1 \leq j \leq q} \max\{|Z^{\perp H_j}|, |Z^{\perp G_j}|\}$$

and that by (10.1) and Corollary 10.2(a), $|Z^{\perp H_j}|^2, |Z^{\perp G_j}|^2 \leq C \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}\|) d\|V\|(X)$, $C = C(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty)$. $\square$

11. BLOWING UP BY FINE EXCESS

Consider sequences of varifolds $V_k \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$ and cones $\mathbf{C}_k \in \mathcal{C}_q$ such that, for each $k = 1, 2, \dots$, with $V_k, \mathbf{C}_k$ in place of $V, \mathbf{C}$ respectively, Hypotheses 10.1 hold with ϵ_k, γ_k in place of ϵ, γ ; Hypothesis $(\star)$ holds with $M = \frac{3}{2}M_0^3$ and Hypothesis $(\star\star)$ holds with β_k in place of β , where $\{\epsilon_k\}, \{\gamma_k\}$ and $\{\beta_k\}$ are sequences of numbers such that $\epsilon_k, \gamma_k, \beta_k \rightarrow 0^+$. Thus, for each $k = 1, 2, \dots$, we suppose:

- (1_k) $\Theta(\|V_k\|, 0) \geq q$, $(2\omega_n)^{-1}\|V_k\|(B_2^{n+1}(0)) < q + 1/2$, $\omega_n^{-1}\|V_k\|(\mathbf{R} \times B_1) < q + 1/2$.
(2_k) $\mathbf{C}_k = \sum_{j=1}^q |H_j^k| + |G_j^k|$ where for each $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, q\}$, H_j^k is the half-space defined by $H_j^k = \{(x^1, x^2, y) \in \mathbf{R}^{n+1} : x^2 < 0 \text{ and } x^1 = \lambda_j^k x^2\}$, G_j^k the half-space defined by $G_j^k = \{(x^1, x^2, y) \in \mathbf{R}^{n+1} : x^2 > 0 \text{ and } x^1 = \mu_j^k x^2\}$, with λ_j^k, μ_j^k constants, $\lambda_1^k \geq \lambda_2^k \geq \dots \geq \lambda_q^k$ and $\mu_1^k \leq \mu_2^k \leq \dots \leq \mu_q^k$.
(3_k) $\hat{E}_k = \hat{E}_{V_k}^2 \equiv \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} |x^1|^2 d\|V_k\|(X) < \epsilon_k$.
(4_k) $\{Z : \Theta(\|V_k\|, Z) \geq q\} \cap (\mathbf{R} \times (B_{1/2} \setminus \{|x^2| < 1/16\})) = \emptyset$.
(5_k) $\hat{E}_k^{-2} (Q_k(\mathbf{C}_k))^2 < \gamma_k$ where

$$(Q_k(\mathbf{C}_k))^2 = (Q_{V_k}(\mathbf{C}_k))^2 = \left(\int_{\mathbf{R} \times (B_{1/2} \setminus \{|x^2| < 1/16\})} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|V_k\|) d\|\mathbf{C}_k\|(X) + \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}_k\|) d\|V_k\|(X) \right).$$

(6_k)

$$\hat{E}_k^2 < \frac{3}{2} M_0^3 \inf_{P=\{x^1=\lambda x^2\}} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|V\|(X).$$

(7_k) Either (i) or (ii) below holds:

(i) $\mathbf{C}_k \in \mathcal{C}_q(4)$.

(ii) $q \geq 3$, $\mathbf{C}_k \in \mathcal{C}_q(p_k)$ for some $p_k \in \{5, 6, \dots, 2q\}$ and $(Q_k^*)^{-2} (Q_k(\mathbf{C}_k))^2 < \beta_k$ where

$$(Q_k^*)^2 = (Q_{V_k}^*(p_k - 1)) = \inf_{\tilde{\mathbf{C}} \in \cup_{j=4}^{p_k-1} \mathcal{C}_q(j)} \left(\int_{\mathbf{R} \times (B_{1/2} \setminus \{|x^2| < 1/16\})} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|V_k\|) d\|\tilde{\mathbf{C}}\|(X) + \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\tilde{\mathbf{C}}\|) d\|V_k\|(X) \right).$$

Let $E_k = \sqrt{\int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}_k\|) d\|V_k\|(X)}$, so that by (5_k),

$$(11.1) \quad \hat{E}_k^{-1} E_k \rightarrow 0.$$

Note also that in case $\mathbf{C}_k \notin \mathcal{C}_q(4)$ except for finitely many k , we have by (3_k) and (5_k) that $Q_k^* \rightarrow 0$.

Let $\{\delta_k\}, \{\tau_k\}$ be sequences of decreasing positive numbers converging to 0. By passing to appropriate subsequences of $\{V_k\}$, $\{\mathbf{C}_k\}$, and possibly replacing $\mathbf{C}_k$ with a cone $\mathbf{C}'_k \in \mathcal{C}_q$ with $\text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}'_k\| = \text{spt } \mathbf{C}_k$ without changing notation (see Remark (2) following the statement of Hypothesis (★★)), we deduce, for each $k = 1, 2, \dots$, the conditions (A_k)-(E_k) below:

(A_k) By Lemma 10.3,

$$(11.2) \quad B_{\delta_k}^{n+1}(0, y) \cap \{Z : \Theta(\|V_k\|, Z) \geq q\} \neq \emptyset$$

for each point $(0, y) \in \{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1} \cap B_{1/2}$ and

$$(11.3) \quad \int_{B_{1/2}^{n+1}(0) \cap \{|(x^1, x^2)| < \sigma\}} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}_k\|) d\|V_k\|(X) \leq C\sigma^{1/2} E_k^2$$

for each $\sigma \in [\delta_k, 1/4]$, where $C = C(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty)$.

(B_k) By Theorem 10.1(a),

$$(11.4) \quad V_k \llcorner (\mathbf{R} \times (B_{1/2} \setminus \{|x^2| < \tau_k\})) = \sum_{j=1}^q |\text{graph}(h_j^k + u_j^k)| + |\text{graph}(g_j^k + w_j^k)|$$

where h_j^k, g_j^k are the linear functions on $\mathbf{R}^n$ given by $h_j^k(x^2, y) = \lambda_j^k x^2$, $g_j^k(x^2, y) = \mu_j^k x^2$, $u_j^k \in C^2(B_{1/2} \cap \{x^2 < -\tau_k\})$, $w_j^k \in C^2(B_{1/2} \cap \{x^2 > \tau_k\})$ with $h_j^k + u_j^k$ and $g_j^k + w_j^k$ solving the minimal surface equation on their respective domains and satisfying $h_1^k + u_1^k \leq h_2^k + u_2^k \leq \dots \leq h_q^k + u_q^k$, $g_1^k + w_1^k \leq g_2^k + w_2^k \leq \dots \leq g_q^k + w_q^k$, $\text{dist}((h_j^k(x^2, y) + u_j^k(x^2, y), x^2, y), \text{spt} \|\mathbf{C}_k\|) = (1 + (\lambda_j^k)^2)^{-1/2} |u_j^k(x^2, y)|$ for $(x^2, y) \in B_{1/2} \cap \{x^2 < -\tau_k\}$ and $\text{dist}((g_j^k(x^2, y) + w_j^k(x^2, y), x^2, y), \text{spt} \|\mathbf{C}_k\|) = (1 + (\mu_j^k)^2)^{-1/2} |w_j^k(x^2, y)|$ for $(x^2, y) \in B_{1/2} \cap \{x^2 > \tau_k\}$.

(C_k) For each point $Z = (\zeta^1, \zeta^2, \eta) \in \text{spt} \|V_k\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_{3/8})$ with $\Theta(\|V_k\|, Z) \geq q$, by Corollary 10.2(a),

$$(11.5) \quad |\zeta^1|^2 + \hat{E}_k^2 |\zeta^2|^2 \leq C E_k^2$$

where $C = C(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty)$.

(D_k) For each point $Z = (\zeta^1, \zeta^2, \eta) \in \text{spt} \|V_k\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_{3/8})$ with $\Theta(\|V_k\|, Z) \geq q$, each $\mu \in (0, 1)$ and each $\rho \in (0, 1/4]$, by Corollary 10.2(c),

$$(11.6) \quad \begin{aligned} & \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_{\rho/2}(\zeta^2, \eta) \cap \{x^2 < -\tau_k \rho\}} \frac{|u_j^k(x^2, y) - (\zeta^1 - \lambda_j^k \zeta^2)|^2}{|(u_j^k(x^2, y), x^2, y) - (\zeta^1, \zeta^2, \eta)|^{n+2-\mu}} dx^2 dy \\ & + \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_{\rho/2}(\zeta^2, \eta) \cap \{x^2 > \tau_k \rho\}} \frac{|w_j^k(x^2, y) - (\zeta^1 - \mu_j^k \zeta^2)|^2}{|(w_j^k(x^2, y), x^2, y) - (\zeta^1, \zeta^2, \eta)|^{n+2-\mu}} dx^2 dy \\ & \leq C_1 \rho^{-n-2+\alpha} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_\rho(\zeta^2, \eta)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt} \|\mathbf{C}_k\|) d\|V_k\|(X) \end{aligned}$$

where $C_1 = C_1(n, q, \alpha, \mu) \in (0, \infty)$.

(E_k) By (10.1) and (10.2),

$$(11.7) \quad \begin{aligned} c \hat{E}_k & \leq \max\{|\lambda_1^k|, |\lambda_q^k|\} \leq c_1 \hat{E}_k, \quad c \hat{E}_k \leq \max\{|\mu_1^k|, |\mu_q^k|\} \leq c_1 \hat{E}_k \quad \text{and} \\ \min\{|\lambda_1^k - \lambda_q^k|, |\mu_1^k - \mu_q^k|\} & \geq 2c \hat{E}_k \end{aligned}$$

where $c_1 = c_1(n) \in (0, \infty)$ and $c = c(n, q) \in (0, \infty)$.

Extend u_j^k, w_j^k to all of $B_{1/2} \cap \{x^2 < 0\}$ and $B_{1/2} \cap \{x^2 > 0\}$ respectively by defining values to be zero in $B_{1/2} \cap \{0 > x^2 \geq -\tau_k\}$ and $B_{1/2} \cap \{0 < x^2 \leq \tau_k\}$ respectively.

By (11.7), there exist numbers ℓ_j, m_j for each $j = 1, 2, \dots, q$ with

$$(11.8) \quad \begin{aligned} c & \leq \max\{|\ell_1|, |\ell_q|\} \leq c_1, \quad c \leq \max\{|m_1|, |m_q|\} \leq c_1 \quad \text{and} \\ \min\{|\ell_1 - \ell_q|, |m_1 - m_q|\} & \geq 2c \end{aligned}$$

such that after passing to appropriate subsequences without changing notation, we have

$$(11.9) \quad \hat{E}_k^{-1} \lambda_j^k \rightarrow \ell_j \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{E}_k^{-1} \mu_j^k \rightarrow m_j$$

for each $j = 1, 2, \dots, q$. By (11.4) and elliptic estimates, there exist harmonic functions $\varphi_j : B_{1/2} \cap \{x^2 < 0\} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ and $\psi_j : B_{1/2} \cap \{x^2 > 0\} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ such that

$$(11.10) \quad E_k^{-1} u_j^k \rightarrow \varphi_j \quad \text{and} \quad E_k^{-1} w_j^k \rightarrow \psi_j$$

where the convergence is in $C^2(K)$ for each compact subset K of the respective domains. From (11.3), it follows that

$$\int_{B_{1/2} \cap \{0 > x^2 > -\sigma\}} |\varphi|^2 \leq C\sigma^{1/2}, \quad \int_{B_{1/2} \cap \{0 < x^2 < \sigma\}} |\psi|^2 \leq C\sigma^{1/2}$$

for each $\sigma \in (0, 1/4)$, where $C = C(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty)$, and hence that the convergence in (11.10) is, respectively, also in $L^2(B_{1/2} \cap \{x^2 < 0\})$ and $L^2(B_{1/2} \cap \{x^2 > 0\})$.

Set $\varphi = (\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \dots, \varphi_q)$ and $\psi = (\psi_1, \psi_2, \dots, \psi_q)$.

Definition: Let $\varphi : B_{1/2} \cap \{x^2 < 0\} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^q$ and $\psi : B_{1/2} \cap \{x^2 > 0\} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^q$ be a pair of functions arising, in the manner described above, corresponding to: (i) a sequence of varifolds $\{V_k\} \subset \mathcal{S}_\alpha$ and a sequence of cones $\{\mathbf{C}_k\} \subset \mathcal{C}_q$ satisfying the hypotheses (1_k) – (7_k) for some sequences of numbers $\{\epsilon_k\}$, $\{\gamma_k\}$, $\{\beta_k\}$ with $\epsilon_k, \gamma_k \beta_k \rightarrow 0^+$ and (ii) sequences $\{\delta_k\}$, $\{\tau_k\}$ of decreasing positive numbers converging to zero such that (11.2), (11.3), (11.4) and (11.6) hold. We call the pair (φ, ψ) a *fine blow-up* of the sequence $\{V_k\}$ relative to $\{\mathbf{C}_k\}$.

Definition: Let $\mathcal{B}^F$ be the collection of all fine blow-ups (φ, ψ) such that the corresponding sequences of varifolds $V_k \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$ satisfies condition (6_k) with M_0^2 in place of M_0^3 ; thus we assume the stronger condition

$$\hat{E}_{V_k}^2 < \frac{3}{2} M_0^2 \inf_{\{P = \{x^1 = \lambda x^2\}\}} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|V_k\|(X), \quad k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$$

in place of (6_k) for any sequence $\{V_k\} \subset \mathcal{S}_\alpha$ giving rise to a fine blow-up belonging to $\mathcal{B}^F$.

12. CONTINUITY ESTIMATES FOR THE FINE BLOW-UPS AND THEIR DERIVATIVES

Let $(\varphi, \psi) \in \mathcal{B}^F$. Here we first use estimates (11.5) and (11.6) to prove a continuity estimate (Lemma 12.1 below) for (φ, ψ) . We then use it to establish the main result of this section (Theorem 12.2), namely, the continuity estimate for the first derivatives of (φ, ψ) .

Lemma 12.1. *If $(\varphi, \psi) \in \mathcal{B}^F$, then*

$$\varphi \in C^{0,\beta}(\overline{B_{5/16} \cap \{x^2 < 0\}}; \mathbf{R}^q), \quad \psi \in C^{0,\beta}(\overline{B_{5/16} \cap \{x^2 > 0\}}; \mathbf{R}^q)$$

for some $\beta = \beta(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, 1)$ and the following estimates hold:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\overline{B_{5/16} \cap \{x^2 < 0\}}} |\varphi|^2 + \sup_{x, z \in \overline{B_{5/16} \cap \{x^2 < 0\}}, x \neq z} \frac{|\varphi(x) - \varphi(z)|^2}{|x - z|^{2\beta}} \\ & \leq C \left(\int_{B_{1/2} \cap \{x^2 < 0\}} |\varphi|^2 + \int_{B_{1/2} \cap \{x^2 > 0\}} |\psi|^2 \right); \\ & \sup_{\overline{B_{5/16} \cap \{x^2 > 0\}}} |\psi|^2 + \sup_{x, z \in \overline{B_{5/16} \cap \{x^2 > 0\}}, x \neq z} \frac{|\psi(x) - \psi(z)|^2}{|x - z|^{2\beta}} \\ & \leq C \left(\int_{B_{1/2} \cap \{x^2 < 0\}} |\varphi|^2 + \int_{B_{1/2} \cap \{x^2 > 0\}} |\psi|^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Here $C = C(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty)$.

Proof. By the definition of fine blow-up, there are sequences $\{V_k\} \subset \mathcal{S}_\alpha$, $\{\mathbf{C}_k\} \subset \mathcal{C}_q$ and sequences of decreasing positive numbers $\{\epsilon_k\}$, $\{\gamma_k\}$, $\{\beta_k\}$, $\{\delta_k\}$, $\{\tau_k\}$ for which all of the assertions of Section 11 hold, with M_0^2 in place of M_0^3 in (6_k).

Let $Y \in \{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1} \cap B_{5/16}$ be arbitrary. By (11.2), for each $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$, there exist $Z_k = (\zeta_1^k, \zeta_2^k, \eta^k) \in \text{spt } \|V_k\|$ with $\Theta(\|V_k\|, Z_k) \geq q$ such that $Z_k \rightarrow Y$. Using (11.3), (11.5), (11.6) (with $\zeta_1^k, \zeta_2^k, \eta^k$ in place of ζ_1, ζ_2, η and $\mu = 1/2$) and (11.9), we deduce that for each $\rho \in (0, 1/4]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_{\rho/2}(Y) \cap \{x^2 < 0\}} \frac{|\varphi_j(x) - (\kappa_1(Y) - \ell_j \kappa_2(Y))|^2}{|x - Y|^{n+3/2}} dx \\
 & + \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_{\rho/2}(Y) \cap \{x^2 > 0\}} \frac{|\psi_j(x) - (\kappa_1(Y) - m_j \kappa_2(Y))|^2}{|x - Y|^{n+3/2}} dx \\
 (12.1) \quad & \leq C_1 \rho^{-n-3/2} \left(\int_{B_\rho(Y) \cap \{x^2 < 0\}} |\varphi|^2 + \int_{B_\rho(Y) \cap \{x^2 > 0\}} |\psi|^2 \right)
 \end{aligned}$$

where $C_1 = C_1(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty)$ and we have set

$$(12.2) \quad \kappa_1(Y) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} E_k^{-1} \zeta_1^k, \quad \kappa_2(Y) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} E_k^{-1} \hat{E}_k \zeta_2^k,$$

both of which limits exist after passing to a subsequence of the original sequence $\{k\}$. Note that by (11.5),

$$(12.3) \quad |\kappa_1(Y)|, |\kappa_2(Y)| \leq C, \quad C = C(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty).$$

Note that our notation here is appropriate, and the limits in (12.2) indeed depend only on Y and are independent of the sequence of points Z_k converging to Y ; this follows directly from the finiteness of the integrals on the left hand side of (12.1) and the fact that, by Lemma 9.1, at least two of the ℓ_j 's and two of the m_j 's are distinct.

For $Y \in \{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1} \cap B_{5/16}$ and each $j = 1, 2, \dots, q$, define

$$(12.4) \quad \varphi_j(Y) = \kappa_1(Y) - \ell_j \kappa_2(Y) \quad \text{and} \quad \psi_j(Y) = \kappa_1(Y) - m_j \kappa_2(Y).$$

Then by (12.1),

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \sigma^{-n} \left(\int_{B_\sigma(Y) \cap \{x^2 < 0\}} |\varphi(x) - \varphi(Y)|^2 dx + \int_{B_\sigma(Y) \cap \{x^2 > 0\}} |\psi(x) - \psi(Y)|^2 dx \right) \\
 (12.5) \quad & \leq C_1 \left(\frac{\sigma}{\rho} \right)^{3/2} \rho^{-n} \left(\int_{B_\rho(Y) \cap \{x^2 < 0\}} |\varphi|^2 + \int_{B_\rho(Y) \cap \{x^2 > 0\}} |\psi|^2 \right)
 \end{aligned}$$

for $0 < \sigma \leq \rho/2 \leq 1/8$. Next we argue that indeed we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \sigma^{-n} \left(\int_{B_\sigma(Y) \cap \{x^2 < 0\}} |\varphi(x) - \varphi(Y)|^2 dx + \int_{B_\sigma(Y) \cap \{x^2 > 0\}} |\psi(x) - \psi(Y)|^2 dx \right) \\
 (12.6) \quad & \leq C_1 \left(\frac{\sigma}{\rho} \right)^{3/2} \rho^{-n} \left(\int_{B_\rho(Y) \cap \{x^2 < 0\}} |\varphi - \varphi(Y)|^2 + \int_{B_\rho(Y) \cap \{x^2 > 0\}} |\psi - \psi(Y)|^2 \right)
 \end{aligned}$$

for each $0 < \sigma \leq \rho/2 \leq 1/32$ and for the same constant $C_1 = C_1(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty)$ as in (12.1) and (12.5). To see this, let $\tilde{V}_k = \eta_{Z_k, 1/4} \# V_k$, where $Z_k \in \text{spt } \|V_k\|$ is such that $\Theta(\|V_k\|, Z_k) \geq q$ and $Z_k \rightarrow Y$. Then by the Remark following the proof of Corollary 10.2, after passing to a subsequence without changing notation, hypothesis (1) $_k$ -(7) $_k$ are satisfied with $\tilde{V}_k$ in place of V_k for each k . Let the fine blow-up (of a suitable subsequence) of $\tilde{V}_k$ (relative to the same cones $\mathbf{C}_k$, and numbers δ_k, τ_k

as associated with (φ, ψ) be $(\tilde{\varphi}, \tilde{\psi})$. Then (since $\Theta(\|\tilde{V}_k\|, 0) \geq q$), we have that $\tilde{\varphi}_j(0) = 0 = \tilde{\psi}_j(0)$ for each $j = 1, 2, \dots, q$, and hence by (12.5) (with $\tilde{\varphi}, \tilde{\psi}$ in place of φ, ψ and 0 in place of Y),

$$(12.7) \quad \begin{aligned} & \sigma^{-n} \left(\int_{B_\sigma(0) \cap \{x^2 < 0\}} |\tilde{\varphi}(x)|^2 dx + \int_{B_\sigma(0) \cap \{x^2 > 0\}} |\tilde{\psi}(x)|^2 dx \right) \\ & \leq C_1 \left(\frac{\sigma}{\rho} \right)^{3/2} \rho^{-n} \left(\int_{B_\rho(0) \cap \{x^2 < 0\}} |\tilde{\varphi}(x)|^2 + \int_{B_\rho(0) \cap \{x^2 > 0\}} |\tilde{\psi}(x)|^2 dx \right). \end{aligned}$$

for $0 < \sigma \leq \rho/2 \leq 1/8$. However, since

$$\begin{aligned} & \tilde{V}_k \llcorner (\mathbf{R} \times (B_{1/2} \setminus \{|x^2| > 2\tau_k\})) \\ & = \sum_{j=1}^q |\text{graph}(h_j^k + u_j^k \circ T_k - (\zeta_1^k - \lambda_j^k \zeta_2^k))| + |\text{graph}(g_j^k + w_j^k \circ T_k - (\zeta_1^k - \mu_j^k \zeta_2^k))| \end{aligned}$$

where $T_k : \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^n$ is the map $x \mapsto \frac{1}{4}x + (\zeta_2^k, \eta_k)$, we see that for each $j = 1, 2, \dots, q$,

$$\tilde{\varphi}_j(x) = \epsilon^{-1} \left(\varphi_j \left(Y + \frac{1}{4}x \right) - \varphi_j(Y) \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\psi}_j(x) = \epsilon^{-1} \left(\psi_j \left(Y + \frac{1}{4}x \right) - \psi_j(Y) \right)$$

where $\epsilon^2 = \sum_{j=1}^q \left(\|\varphi_j(Y + \frac{1}{4}(\cdot)) - \varphi_j(Y)\|_{L^2(B_1)}^2 + \|\psi_j(Y + \frac{1}{4}(\cdot)) - \psi_j(Y)\|_{L^2(B_1)}^2 \right)$. By (12.7), this readily implies (12.6).

To complete the proof of the lemma, we follow the argument of Lemma 4.3. Consider an arbitrary point $z^+ \in B_{5/16} \cap \{x^2 > 0\}$ and let $\rho \in (0, 1/16]$. Denote by z^- the image of z^+ under reflection across $\{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1}$. Letting $Y \in \{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1}$ be the point such that $|z^- - Y| = |z^+ - Y| = \text{dist}(z^+, \{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1})$, and with $\gamma = \gamma(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, 1/16]$ to be chosen, if $\text{dist}(z^+, \{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1}) < \gamma\rho$, then

$$(12.8) \quad \begin{aligned} & (\gamma\rho)^{-n} \left(\int_{B_{\gamma\rho}(z^-) \cap \{x^2 < 0\}} |\varphi - \varphi(Y)|^2 + \int_{B_{\gamma\rho}(z^+) \cap \{x^2 > 0\}} |\psi - \psi(Y)|^2 \right) \\ & \leq 2^n (\gamma\rho + |z^- - Y|)^{-n} \left(\int_{B_{\gamma\rho + |z^- - Y|}(Y) \cap \{x^2 < 0\}} |\varphi - \varphi(Y)|^2 + \int_{B_{\gamma\rho + |z^+ - Y|}(Y) \cap \{x^2 > 0\}} |\psi - \psi(Y)|^2 \right) \\ & \leq 2^n C_1 \left(\frac{\gamma\rho + |z^- - Y|}{\rho - |z^- - Y|} \right)^{3/2} (\rho - |z^- - Y|)^{-n} \left(\int_{B_{\rho - |z^- - Y|}(Y) \cap \{x^2 < 0\}} |\varphi - \varphi(Y)|^2 \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \int_{B_{\rho - |z^+ - Y|}(Y) \cap \{x^2 > 0\}} |\psi - \psi(Y)|^2 \right) \\ & \leq 4^n C_1 \left(\frac{2\gamma}{1 - \gamma} \right)^{3/2} \rho^{-n} \left(\int_{B_\rho(z^-) \cap \{x^2 < 0\}} |\varphi - \varphi(Y)|^2 + \int_{B_\rho(z^+) \cap \{x^2 > 0\}} |\psi - \psi(Y)|^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Choosing $\gamma = \gamma(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, 1/16]$ such that $4^n C_1 \left(\frac{2\gamma}{1 - \gamma} \right)^{3/2} < 1/4$, we deduce that

$$(12.9) \quad \begin{aligned} & (\gamma\rho)^{-n} \left(\int_{B_{\gamma\rho}(z^-) \cap \{x^2 < 0\}} |\varphi - \varphi(Y)|^2 + \int_{B_{\gamma\rho}(z^+) \cap \{x^2 > 0\}} |\psi - \psi(Y)|^2 \right) \\ & \leq 4^{-1} \rho^{-n} \left(\int_{B_\rho(z^-) \cap \{x^2 < 0\}} |\varphi - \varphi(Y)|^2 + \int_{B_\rho(z^+) \cap \{x^2 > 0\}} |\psi - \psi(Y)|^2 \right) \end{aligned}$$

for any $z^+ \in B_{5/16} \cap \{x^2 > 0\}$ and $\rho \in (0, 1/16]$ provided $\gamma\rho > |z^+ - Y| = |z^- - Y| = \text{dist}(z^+, \{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1})$. If on the other hand $\gamma\rho \leq \text{dist}(z^+, \{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1})$, since φ and ψ are harmonic in $B_{1/2} \cap \{x^2 < 0\}$ and $B_{1/2} \cap \{x^2 > 0\}$ respectively, we have for each $\sigma \in (0, 1/2]$ and any constant vectors $b^+, b^- \in \mathbf{R}^q$,

$$(12.10) \quad (\sigma\gamma\rho)^{-n} \left(\int_{B_{\sigma\gamma\rho}(z^-)} |\varphi - \varphi(z^-)|^2 + \int_{B_{\sigma\gamma\rho}(z^+)} |\psi - \psi(z^+)|^2 \right) \leq C\sigma^2(\gamma\rho)^{-n} \left(\int_{B_{\gamma\rho}(z^-)} |\varphi - b^-|^2 + \int_{B_{\gamma\rho}(z^+)} |\psi - b^+|^2 \right)$$

where $C = C(n) \in (0, \infty)$.

Given any $z^+ \in B_{5/16} \cap \{x^2 > 0\}$, let $j_\star \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ be such that $\gamma^{j_\star+1} < \text{dist}(z^+, \{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1}) \leq \gamma^{j_\star}$. Then, with $Y \in \{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1}$ such that $|z^+ - Y| = \text{dist}(z^+, \{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1})$, by (12.10),

$$(12.11) \quad (\sigma\gamma^{j_\star+1})^{-n} \left(\int_{B_{\sigma\gamma^{j_\star+1}}(z^-)} |\varphi - \varphi(z^-)|^2 + \int_{B_{\sigma\gamma^{j_\star+1}}(z^+)} |\psi - \psi(z^+)|^2 \right) \leq C\sigma^2(\gamma^{j_\star+1})^{-n} \left(\int_{B_{\gamma^{j_\star+1}}(z^-)} |\varphi - \varphi(Y)|^2 + \int_{B_{\gamma^{j_\star+1}}(z^+)} |\psi - \psi(Y)|^2 \right)$$

for any $\sigma \in (0, 1/2]$, and if $j_\star \geq 1$, by (12.9),

$$(12.12) \quad (\gamma^j)^{-n} \left(\int_{B_{\gamma^j}(z^-) \cap \{x^2 < 0\}} |\varphi - \varphi(Y)|^2 + \int_{B_{\gamma^j}(z^+) \cap \{x^2 > 0\}} |\psi - \psi(Y)|^2 \right) \leq 4^{-1}(\gamma^{j-1})^{-n} \left(\int_{B_{\gamma^{j-1}}(z^-) \cap \{x^2 < 0\}} |\varphi - \varphi(Y)|^2 + \int_{B_{\gamma^{j-1}}(z^+) \cap \{x^2 > 0\}} |\psi - \psi(Y)|^2 \right) \leq 4^{-(j-1)}\gamma^{-n} \left(\int_{B_\gamma(z^-) \cap \{x^2 < 0\}} |\varphi - \varphi(Y)|^2 + \int_{B_\gamma(z^+) \cap \{x^2 > 0\}} |\psi - \psi(Y)|^2 \right)$$

for $j = 1, 2, \dots, j_\star$. If $j_\star \geq 1$, taking $j = j_\star$ in (12.12) and $\sigma = 1/2$ in (12.11), we see by the triangle inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} & |\varphi(z^-) - \varphi(Y)|^2 + |\psi(z^+) - \psi(Y)|^2 \\ & \leq C4^{-(j_\star-1)}\gamma^{-n} \left(\int_{B_\gamma(z^-) \cap \{x^2 < 0\}} |\varphi - \varphi(Y)|^2 + \int_{B_\gamma(z^+) \cap \{x^2 > 0\}} |\psi - \psi(Y)|^2 \right) \end{aligned}$$

where $C = C(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty)$, and hence by (12.12) and the triangle inequality again that

$$(12.13) \quad (\gamma^j)^{-n} \left(\int_{B_{\gamma^j}(z^-) \cap \{x^2 < 0\}} |\varphi - \varphi(z^-)|^2 + \int_{B_{\gamma^j}(z^+) \cap \{x^2 > 0\}} |\psi - \psi(z^+)|^2 \right) \leq C4^{-(j-1)}\gamma^{-n} \left(\int_{B_\gamma(z^-) \cap \{x^2 < 0\}} |\varphi - \varphi(Y)|^2 + \int_{B_\gamma(z^+) \cap \{x^2 > 0\}} |\psi - \psi(Y)|^2 \right)$$

for $j = 1, 2, \dots, j_*$, where $C = C(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty)$. With the help of (12.11), (12.12) and (12.13), we deduce that for any given $z^+ \in B_{5/16} \cap \{x^2 > 0\}$,

$$(12.14) \quad \begin{aligned} & \rho^{-n} \left(\int_{B_\rho(z^-) \cap \{x^2 < 0\}} |\varphi - \varphi(z^-)|^2 + \int_{B_\rho(z^+) \cap \{x^2 > 0\}} |\psi - \psi(z^+)|^2 \right) \\ & \leq C \rho^{2\beta} \left(\int_{B_{1/2} \cap \{x^2 < 0\}} |\varphi|^2 + \int_{B_{1/2} \cap \{x^2 > 0\}} |\psi|^2 \right) \end{aligned}$$

for all $\rho \in (0, \gamma]$, where $C = C(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty)$ and $\beta = \beta(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, 1)$, by considering, for any given $\rho \in (0, \gamma]$, the alternatives $2\rho \leq \gamma^{j_*+1}$, in which case $\rho = \sigma \gamma^{j_*+1}$ for some $\sigma \in (0, 1/2]$ and we use (12.11) and (12.12) with $j = j_*$, or $\gamma^{j+1} < 2\rho \leq \gamma^j$ for some $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, j_*\}$, in which case we use (12.13). Note that here we have also used (12.5) with $\sigma = \gamma$ and $\rho = 2\gamma$. The conclusions of the lemma follow readily from (12.14). $\square$

Theorem 12.2. *If $(\varphi, \psi) \in \mathcal{B}^F$, then*

$$\varphi \in C^2(\overline{B_{1/4} \cap \{x^2 < 0\}}; \mathbf{R}^q), \quad \psi \in C^2(\overline{B_{1/4} \cap \{x^2 > 0\}}; \mathbf{R}^q)$$

and the following estimates hold:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{B_{1/4} \cap \{x^2 < 0\}} |D\varphi|^2 + \sup_{x, z \in \overline{B_{1/4} \cap \{x^2 < 0\}}, x \neq z} \frac{|D\varphi(x) - D\varphi(z)|^2}{|x - z|^2} \\ & \leq C \left(\int_{B_{1/2} \cap \{x^2 < 0\}} |\varphi|^2 + \int_{B_{1/2} \cap \{x^2 > 0\}} |\psi|^2 \right); \\ & \sup_{B_{1/4} \cap \{x^2 < 0\}} |D\psi|^2 + \sup_{x, z \in \overline{B_{1/4} \cap \{x^2 < 0\}}, x \neq z} \frac{|D\psi(x) - D\psi(z)|^2}{|x - z|^2} \\ & \leq C \left(\int_{B_{1/2} \cap \{x^2 < 0\}} |\varphi|^2 + \int_{B_{1/2} \cap \{x^2 > 0\}} |\psi|^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Here $C = C(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty)$.

Proof. By the definition of $\mathcal{B}^F$, there are sequence $\{V_k\} \subset \mathcal{S}_\alpha$, $\{\mathbf{C}_k\} \subset \mathcal{C}_q$ and sequences of decreasing positive numbers $\{\epsilon_k\}$, $\{\gamma_k\}$, $\{\beta_k\}$, $\{\delta_k\}$, $\{\tau_k\}$ for which all of the assertions of Section 11 hold, with M_0^2 in place of M_0^3 in condition (6_k).

By (3.1),

$$(12.15) \quad \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \nabla^{V_k} x^1 \cdot \nabla^{V_k} \tilde{\zeta} d\|V_k\|(X) = 0$$

for each $k = 1, 2, \dots$ and any $\tilde{\zeta} \in C_c^1(\mathbf{R} \times B_1)$. Let $\tau \in (0, 1/32)$ be arbitrary. Choose any $\zeta \in C_c^2(B_{3/8})$ with $\frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial x^2} \equiv 0$ in $\{|x^2| < 2\tau\}$, and set $\zeta_1(x^1, x^2, y) = \zeta(x^2, y)$ for $(x^1, x^2, y) \in \mathbf{R} \times B_{1/2}$. Let $\tilde{\zeta} \in C_c^1(\mathbf{R} \times B_{3/8})$ be such that $\tilde{\zeta} \equiv \zeta_1$ in a neighborhood of $\text{spt } \|V_k\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_{3/8})$ for all

$k = 1, 2, \dots$. By (12.15) and (11.4), for all sufficiently large k ,

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \int_{\mathbf{R} \times (B_{3/8} \cap \{|x^2| < 2\tau\})} \nabla^{V_k} x^1 \cdot \nabla^{V_k} \tilde{\zeta} d\|V_k\|(X) \\
 & + \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_{3/8} \cap \{x^2 \leq -2\tau\}} \sqrt{1 + |D(h_j^k + u_j^k)|^2} D(h_j^k + u_j^k) \cdot D\zeta \, dx \\
 & + \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_{3/8} \cap \{x^2 \geq 2\tau\}} \sqrt{1 + |D(g_j^k + w_j^k)|^2} D(g_j^k + w_j^k) \cdot D\zeta \, dx = 0.
 \end{aligned} \tag{12.16}$$

Since $\frac{\partial \tilde{\zeta}}{\partial x^1} = 0$ in a neighborhood of $\text{spt } \|V_k\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_{1/2})$ and $\frac{\partial \tilde{\zeta}}{\partial x^2} = 0$ in $\{|x^2| < 2\tau\}$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \left| \int_{\mathbf{R} \times (B_{3/8} \cap \{|x^2| < 2\tau\})} \nabla^{V_k} x^1 \cdot \nabla^{V_k} \tilde{\zeta} d\|V_k\|(X) \right| = \left| \int_{\mathbf{R} \times (B_{3/8} \cap \{|x^2| < 2\tau\})} e_1 \cdot \nabla^{V_k} \tilde{\zeta} d\|V_k\|(X) \right| \\
 & \leq \sup |D\zeta| \sum_{j=3}^{n+1} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times (B_{3/8} \cap \{|x^2| < 2\tau\})} |e_j^{\perp k}| d\|V_k\|(X) \\
 & \leq \sup |D\zeta| (\|V_k\|(\mathbf{R} \times (B_{3/8} \cap \{|x^2| < 2\tau\})))^{1/2} \left(\sum_{j=3}^{n+1} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_{3/8}} |e_j^{\perp k}|^2 d\|V_k\|(X) \right)^{1/2} \\
 & \leq C \sup |D\zeta| \sqrt{\tau} E_k
 \end{aligned} \tag{12.17}$$

where $C = C(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty)$ and the last inequality is a consequence of Theorem 10.1(c) and the fact that $\|V_k\|(\mathbf{R} \times (B_{3/8} \cap \{|x^2| < 2\tau\})) \leq C\sqrt{\tau}$, $C = C(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty)$, for all sufficiently large k .

Since $h_j^k(x) = \lambda_j^k x^2$, we have for each $j = 1, 2, \dots, q$ and $k = 1, 2, \dots$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \int_{B_{3/8} \cap \{x^2 \leq -2\tau\}} \sqrt{1 + |D(h_j^k + u_j^k)|^2} D(h_j^k + u_j^k) \cdot D\zeta \, dx \\
 & = \int_{B_{3/8} \cap \{x^2 \leq -2\tau\}} \sqrt{1 + |D(h_j^k + u_j^k)|^2} Du_j^k \cdot D\zeta \, dx \\
 & \quad + \lambda_j^k \int_{B_{3/8} \cap \{x^2 \leq -2\tau\}} \frac{D(2h_j^k + u_j^k) \cdot Du_j^k}{\sqrt{1 + |D(h_j^k + u_j^k)|^2} + \sqrt{1 + (\lambda_j^k)^2}} \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial x^2} \, dx \\
 & \quad + \lambda_j^k \sqrt{1 + (\lambda_j^k)^2} \int_{B_{3/8} \cap \{x^2 \leq -2\tau\}} \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial x^2} \, dx.
 \end{aligned} \tag{12.18}$$

By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and elliptic estimates

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \left| \int_{B_{3/8} \cap \{x^2 \leq -2\tau\}} \frac{D(2h_j^k + u_j^k) \cdot Du_j^k}{\sqrt{1 + |D(h_j^k + u_j^k)|^2} + \sqrt{1 + (\lambda_j^k)^2}} \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial x^2} \, dx \right| \\
 & \leq C(\tau) \sup |D\zeta| \sqrt{|\lambda_j^k|^2 + \int_{B_{1/2} \cap \{x^2 \leq -\tau\}} |u_j^k|^2 \, dx} \sqrt{\int_{B_{1/2} \cap \{x^2 \leq -\tau\}} |u_j^k|^2 \, dx} \\
 & \leq C(\tau) \sup |D\zeta| \sqrt{|\lambda_j^k|^2 + E_k^2} E_k.
 \end{aligned} \tag{12.19}$$

If ζ also satisfies

$$(12.20) \quad \int_{B_{3/8} \cap (\{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1})} \zeta \, dy = 0$$

then, since $\int_{B_{3/8} \cap \{x^2 \leq -2\tau\}} \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial x^2} \, dx = \int_{B_{3/8} \cap \{x^2 \leq 0\}} \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial x^2} \, dx = - \int_{B_{3/8} \cap (\{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1})} \zeta \, dy$, the last term on the right hand side of (12.18) will be zero. Thus, for each fixed $\tau > 0$ and each $\zeta \in C_c^1(B_{3/8})$ with $\frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial x^2} = 0$ in $\{|x^2| < 2\tau\}$ and satisfying (12.20), we have

$$(12.21) \quad \begin{aligned} & \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_{3/8} \cap \{x^2 \leq -2\tau\}} \sqrt{1 + |D(h_j^k + u_j^k)|^2} D(h_j^k + u_j^k) \cdot D\zeta \, dx \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_{3/8} \cap \{x^2 \leq -2\tau\}} \sqrt{1 + |D(h_j^k + u_j^k)|^2} D u_j^k \cdot D\zeta \, dx + \epsilon_k^- \end{aligned}$$

and, by a similar argument,

$$(12.22) \quad \begin{aligned} & \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_{3/8} \cap \{x^2 \geq 2\tau\}} \sqrt{1 + |D(g_j^k + w_j^k)|^2} D(g_j^k + w_j^k) \cdot D\zeta \, dx \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_{3/8} \cap \{x^2 \geq 2\tau\}} \sqrt{1 + |D(g_j^k + w_j^k)|^2} D w_j^k \cdot D\zeta \, dx + \epsilon_k^+ \end{aligned}$$

where $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} E_k^{-1} |\epsilon_k^-| = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} E_k^{-1} |\epsilon_k^+| = 0$. We may divide (12.16) by E_k and let $k \rightarrow \infty$ to deduce, by (12.17), (12.21), (12.22) and (11.10), that for each $\tau \in (0, 1/16)$,

$$(12.23) \quad \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_{3/8} \cap \{x^2 \leq -2\tau\}} D\varphi_j \cdot D\zeta + \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_{3/8} \cap \{x^2 \geq 2\tau\}} D\psi_j \cdot D\zeta + \epsilon(\tau) = 0$$

where $\epsilon(\tau) \rightarrow 0$ as $\tau \rightarrow 0$. Upon integration by parts (in view of the fact that $\frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial x^2} = 0$ in $\{|x^2| < 2\tau\}$), this gives

$$(12.24) \quad \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_{3/8} \cap \{x^2 \leq -2\tau\}} \varphi_j \Delta \zeta + \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_{3/8} \cap \{x^2 \geq 2\tau\}} \psi_j \Delta \zeta - \epsilon(\tau) = 0.$$

Since $\varphi_j \in L^1(B_{1/2} \cap \{x^2 \leq 0\})$ and $\psi_j \in L^1(B_{1/2} \cap \{x^2 \geq 0\})$ for each $j = 1, 2, \dots, q$, we may let $\tau \rightarrow 0$ in (12.24) to conclude that

$$(12.25) \quad \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_{3/8} \cap \{x^2 \leq 0\}} \varphi_j \Delta \zeta + \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_{3/8} \cap \{x^2 \geq 0\}} \psi_j \Delta \zeta = 0$$

for any $\zeta \in C_c^2(B_{3/8})$ with $\frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial x^2} = 0$ in a neighborhood of $\{x^2 = 0\}$ and satisfying (12.20).

Now for any $\ell \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$, $h \in (-1/16, 1/16)$ and any $\zeta \in C_c^2(B_{5/16})$ with $\frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial x^2} = 0$ in a neighborhood of $\{x^2 = 0\}$, we have that $\delta_{\ell, h} \zeta \in C_c^1(B_{3/8})$, $\frac{\partial}{\partial x^2} \delta_{\ell, h} \zeta = 0$ in a neighborhood of $\{x^2 = 0\}$ and $\delta_{\ell, h} \zeta$ satisfies (12.20), where $\delta_{\ell, h} \zeta(x^2, y) = \zeta(x^2, y^1, \dots, y^\ell + h, y^{\ell+1}, \dots, y^{n-1}) - \zeta(x^2, y)$. Thus, by (12.25),

$$\sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_{3/8} \cap \{x^2 < 0\}} \varphi_j \Delta \delta_{\ell, h} \zeta + \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_{3/8} \cap \{x^2 > 0\}} \psi_j \Delta \delta_{\ell, h} \zeta = 0$$

and consequently,

$$(12.26) \quad \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_{5/16} \cap \{x^2 < 0\}} \delta_{\ell,h} \varphi_j \Delta \zeta + \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_{5/16} \cap \{x^2 > 0\}} \delta_{\ell,h} \psi_j \Delta \zeta = 0$$

for any $\zeta \in C_c^2(B_{5/16})$ with $\frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial x^2} = 0$ in a neighborhood of $\{x^2 = 0\}$, any $\ell \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$ and $h \in (-1/16, 1/16)$. Since any $\zeta \in C_c^2(B_{5/16})$ which is even in the x^2 variable can be approximate in $C^2(B_{5/16})$ by a sequence $\zeta_i \in C_c^2(B_{5/16})$ satisfying, for each $i = 1, 2, 3, \dots$, $\frac{\partial \zeta_i}{\partial x^2} = 0$ in a neighborhood of $\{x^2 = 0\}$, we see that (12.26) holds for any $\zeta \in C_c^2(B_{5/16})$ which is even in the x^2 variable and for each $\ell \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$ and $h \in (-1/16, 1/16)$. Thus

$$(12.27) \quad \int_{B_{5/16}} \Phi_{\ell,h} \Delta \zeta = 0$$

for any $\zeta \in C_c^2(B_{5/16})$ which is even in the x^2 variable, any $\ell \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$ and $h \in (-1/16, 1/16)$, where $\Phi_{\ell,h} : B_{3/8} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is the function defined by $\Phi_{\ell,h}(x^2, y) = \sum_{j=1}^q \delta_{\ell,h} \varphi_j(-x^2, y) + \delta_{\ell,h} \psi_j(x^2, y)$ if $x^2 \geq 0$ and $\Phi_{\ell,h}(x^2, y) = \sum_{j=1}^q \delta_{\ell,h} \varphi_j(x^2, y) + \delta_{\ell,h} \psi_j(-x^2, y)$ if $x^2 < 0$. Since Φ is even in the x^2 variable, (12.27) holds also for any ζ which is odd in the x^2 variable. Thus (12.27) holds for every $\zeta \in C_c^2(B_{5/16})$ and hence $\Phi_{\ell,h}$ is a smooth harmonic function in $B_{5/16}$. Since we have directly from the definition of $\Phi_{\ell,h}$ and Lemma 12.1 that

$$(12.28) \quad \left| \int_{B_{5/16}} h^{-1} \Phi_{\ell,h} \right| \leq C \left(\int_{B_{1/2} \cap \{x^2 \leq 0\}} |\varphi|^2 + \int_{B_{1/2} \cap \{x^2 \geq 0\}} |\psi|^2 \right)^{1/2}$$

for all $h \in (-1/16, 1/16) \setminus \{0\}$, where $C = C(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty)$, it follows from standard estimates for harmonic functions that there exists a harmonic function $\Phi_\ell : B_{9/32} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ such that $h^{-1} \Phi_{\ell,h} \rightarrow \Phi_\ell$ in $C^2(B_{9/32})$ as $h \rightarrow 0$, and

$$(12.29) \quad \sup_{B_{9/32}} |\Phi_\ell|^2 + |D\Phi_\ell|^2 \leq C \left(\int_{B_{1/2} \cap \{x^2 \leq 0\}} |\varphi|^2 + \int_{B_{1/2} \cap \{x^2 \geq 0\}} |\psi|^2 \right).$$

Let $\Phi : B_{1/2} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be the function defined by $\Phi(x^2, y) = \sum_{j=1}^q \varphi_j(x^2, y) + \psi_j(-x^2, y)$ if $x^2 < 0$ and $\Phi(x^2, y) = \sum_{j=1}^q \varphi_j(-x^2, y) + \psi_j(x^2, y)$ if $x^2 \geq 0$. Since $\Phi_\ell = \frac{\partial}{\partial y^\ell} \Phi$ on $B_{1/2} \setminus (\{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1})$, it follows that for $(x^2, y) \in B_{9/32} \setminus (\{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1})$,

$$\Phi(x^2, y) = \Phi(x^2, y^1, \dots, y^{\ell-1}, 0, y^{\ell+1}, \dots, y^{n-1}) + \int_0^{y^\ell} \Phi_\ell(x^2, y^1, \dots, y^{\ell-1}, t, y^{\ell+1}, \dots, y^{n-1}) dt,$$

so we may let $x^2 \rightarrow 0$ on both sides of this and use Lemma 12.1, (12.4) and the arbitrariness of the index $\ell \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$ to conclude that, with $Y = (0, y)$,

$$(12.30) \quad \Phi(Y) = 2q\kappa_1(Y) - \left(\sum_{j=1}^q (\ell_j + m_j) \right) \kappa_2(Y)$$

is a C^2 function of $Y \in B_{9/32} \cap (\{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1})$ (with $\frac{\partial}{\partial y^\ell} \Phi(Y) = \Phi_\ell(Y)$ and $\frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^m \partial y^\ell} \Phi(Y) = \frac{\partial}{\partial y^m} \Phi_\ell(Y)$ for each $\ell, m \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$) satisfying, by (12.29) and Lemma 12.1, the estimate

$$(12.31) \quad \sup_{B_{9/32} \cap (\{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1})} |\Phi|^2 + |D_Y \Phi|^2 + |D_Y^2 \Phi|^2 \leq C \left(\int_{B_{1/2} \cap \{x^2 \leq 0\}} |\varphi|^2 + \int_{B_{1/2} \cap \{x^2 \geq 0\}} |\psi|^2 \right)$$

where $C = C(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty)$.

Next we derive regularity estimates for a different linear combination of κ_1 and κ_2 . For this, we note that by (3.1) again,

$$(12.32) \quad \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \nabla^{V_k} x^2 \cdot \nabla^{V_k} \tilde{\zeta} d\|V_k\|(X) = 0$$

for each $k = 1, 2, \dots$ and each $\tilde{\zeta} \in C_c^1(\mathbf{R} \times B_1)$. Let $\tau \in (0, 1/16)$, $\zeta \in C_c^2(B_{3/8})$ and $\tilde{\zeta}$ be as before, so that in particular $\frac{\partial \tilde{\zeta}}{\partial x^2} = 0$ in $\{|x^2| < 2\tau\}$. Note that the unit normal ν_j^k to $(\mathcal{M}_j^k)^- \equiv \text{graph}(h_j^k + u_j^k)$ is given by $\nu_j^k = \left((1 + |D(h_j^k + u_j^k)|^2)^{-1/2} \left(1, -\lambda_j^k - \frac{\partial u_j^k}{\partial x^2}, -D_y u_j^k\right)\right)$ so that, on $(\mathcal{M}_j^k)^-$,

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla^{V_k} x^2 \cdot \nabla^{V_k} \tilde{\zeta} &= e_2 \cdot \left(D\tilde{\zeta} - (D\tilde{\zeta} \cdot \nu_j^k) \nu_j^k\right) \\ &= \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial x^2} - \left(1 + |D(h_j^k + u_j^k)|^2\right)^{-1} \left(\lambda_j^k + \frac{\partial u_j^k}{\partial x^2}\right) \left(\left(\lambda_j^k + \frac{\partial u_j^k}{\partial x^2}\right) \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial x^2} + D_y u_j^k \cdot D_y \zeta\right) \\ &= \left(1 + |D(h_j^k + u_j^k)|^2\right)^{-1} \left(\left(1 + |D_y u_j^k|^2\right) \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial x^2} + \left(\lambda_j^k + \frac{\partial u_j^k}{\partial x^2}\right) D_y u_j^k \cdot D_y \zeta\right). \end{aligned}$$

Using this and similar expressions for $\nabla^{V_k} x^2 \cdot \nabla^{V_k} \tilde{\zeta}$ on $(\mathcal{M}_j^k)^+ \equiv \text{graph}(g_j^k + w_j^k)$, we deduce from (12.32) and Theorem 10.1(a) that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbf{R} \times (B_{3/8} \cap \{|x^2| < 2\tau\})} \nabla^{V_k} x^2 \cdot \nabla^{V_k} \tilde{\zeta} d\|V_k\|(X) \\ &+ \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_{3/8} \cap \{x^2 \leq -2\tau\}} \frac{(1 + |D_y u_j^k|^2) \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial x^2} + (\lambda_j^k + \frac{\partial u_j^k}{\partial x^2}) D_y u_j^k \cdot D_y \zeta}{\sqrt{1 + |D(h_j^k + u_j^k)|^2}} dx \\ (12.33) \quad &+ \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_{3/8} \cap \{x^2 \geq 2\tau\}} \frac{(1 + |D_y w_j^k|^2) \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial x^2} + (\mu_j^k + \frac{\partial w_j^k}{\partial x^2}) D_y w_j^k \cdot D_y \zeta}{\sqrt{1 + |D(g_j^k + w_j^k)|^2}} dx = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\frac{\partial \tilde{\zeta}}{\partial x^1} = 0$ in a neighborhood of $\text{spt } \|V_k\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_{1/2})$ and $\frac{\partial \tilde{\zeta}}{\partial x^2} = 0$ in $\{|x^2| < 2\tau\}$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \int_{\mathbf{R} \times (B_{3/8} \cap \{|x^2| < 2\tau\})} \nabla^{V_k} x^2 \cdot \nabla^{V_k} \tilde{\zeta} d\|V_k\|(X) \right| = \left| \int_{\mathbf{R} \times (B_{3/8} \cap \{|x^2| < 2\tau\})} e_2 \cdot \nabla^{V_k} \tilde{\zeta} d\|V_k\|(X) \right| \\ &\leq \sup |D\zeta| \sum_{j=3}^{n+1} \int_{(B_{3/8} \cap \{|x^2| < 2\tau\}) \times \mathbf{R}} |e_2^{\perp k}| |e_j^{\perp k}| d\|V_k\|(X) \\ &\leq \sup |D\zeta| \left(\int_{\mathbf{R} \times (B_{3/8} \cap \{|x^2| < 2\tau\})} |e_2^{\perp k}|^2 d\|V_k\|(X) \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{j=3}^{n+1} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_{3/8}} |e_j^{\perp k}|^2 d\|V_k\|(X) \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \sup |D\zeta| \left(\int_{\mathbf{R} \times (B_{3/8} \cap \{|x^2| < 2\tau\})} 1 - |e_1^{\perp k}|^2 d\|V_k\|(X) \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{j=3}^{n+1} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_{3/8}} |e_j^{\perp k}|^2 d\|V_k\|(X) \right)^{1/2} \\ (12.34) \quad &\leq C \sup |D\zeta| \tau^{1/4} \hat{E}_k E_k \end{aligned}$$

for all sufficiently large k , where $C = C(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty)$ and the last inequality follows from Theorem 10.1(c), Theorem 6.1(b) and Lemma 10.3. Since

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{B_{3/8} \cap \{x^2 \leq -2\tau\}} \frac{(1 + |D_y u_j^k|^2) \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial x^2} + (\lambda_j^k + \frac{\partial u_j^k}{\partial x^2}) D_y u_j^k \cdot D_y \zeta}{\sqrt{1 + |D(h_j^k + u_j^k)|^2}} dx \\
&= \int_{B_{3/8} \cap \{x^2 \leq -2\tau\}} \frac{\lambda_j^k D_y u_j^k \cdot D_y \zeta}{\sqrt{1 + |D(h_j^k + u_j^k)|^2}} dx + \int_{B_{3/8} \cap \{x^2 \leq -2\tau\}} \frac{|D_y u_j^k|^2 \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial u_j^k}{\partial x^2} D_y u_j^k \cdot D_y \zeta}{\sqrt{1 + |D(h_j^k + u_j^k)|^2}} dx \\
&\quad + \int_{B_{3/8} \cap \{x^2 \leq -2\tau\}} \frac{(2\lambda_j^k \frac{\partial u_j^k}{\partial x^2} + |D u_j^k|^2) \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial x^2}}{\sqrt{1 + |\lambda_j^k|^2} \sqrt{1 + |D(h_j^k + u_j^k)|^2} \left(\sqrt{1 + |\lambda_j^k|^2} + \sqrt{1 + |D(h_j^k + u_j^k)|^2} \right)} dx \\
(12.35) \quad &+ \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + |\lambda_j^k|^2}} \int_{B_{3/8} \cap \{x^2 \leq -2\tau\}} \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial x^2} dx,
\end{aligned}$$

it follows that if ζ satisfies also (12.20), then

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{B_{3/8} \cap \{x^2 \leq -2\tau\}} \frac{(1 + |D_y u_j^k|^2) \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial x^2} + (\lambda_j^k + \frac{\partial u_j^k}{\partial x^2}) D_y u_j^k \cdot D_y \zeta}{\sqrt{1 + |D(h_j^k + u_j^k)|^2}} dx \\
&= \int_{B_{3/8} \cap \{x^2 \leq -2\tau\}} \frac{2\lambda_j^k \frac{\partial u_j^k}{\partial x^2} \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial x^2}}{\sqrt{1 + |\lambda_j^k|^2} \sqrt{1 + |D(h_j^k + u_j^k)|^2} \left(\sqrt{1 + |\lambda_j^k|^2} + \sqrt{1 + |D(h_j^k + u_j^k)|^2} \right)} dx \\
(12.36) \quad &+ \int_{B_{3/8} \cap \{x^2 \leq -2\tau\}} \frac{\lambda_j^k D_y u_j^k \cdot D_y \zeta}{\sqrt{1 + |D(h_j^k + u_j^k)|^2}} dx + \eta_k^-
\end{aligned}$$

where, by elliptic estimates,

$$(12.37) \quad |\eta_k^-| \leq C E_k^2, \quad C = C(n, q, \tau) \in (0, \infty).$$

By the same argument,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{B_{3/8} \cap \{x^2 \geq 2\tau\}} \frac{(1 + |D_y w_j^k|^2) \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial x^2} + (\mu_j^k + \frac{\partial w_j^k}{\partial x^2}) D_y w_j^k \cdot D_y \zeta}{\sqrt{1 + |D(g_j^k + w_j^k)|^2}} dx \\
&= \int_{B_{3/8} \cap \{x^2 \geq 2\tau\}} \frac{2\mu_j^k \frac{\partial w_j^k}{\partial x^2} \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial x^2}}{\sqrt{1 + |\mu_j^k|^2} \sqrt{1 + |D(g_j^k + w_j^k)|^2} \left(\sqrt{1 + |\mu_j^k|^2} + \sqrt{1 + |D(g_j^k + w_j^k)|^2} \right)} dx \\
(12.38) \quad &+ \int_{B_{3/8} \cap \{x^2 \geq 2\tau\}} \frac{\mu_j^k D_y w_j^k \cdot D_y \zeta}{\sqrt{1 + |D(g_j^k + w_j^k)|^2}} dx + \eta_k^+
\end{aligned}$$

where, again by elliptic estimates,

$$(12.39) \quad |\eta_k^+| \leq C E_k^2, \quad C = C(n, q, \tau) \in (0, \infty).$$

Dividing (12.33) by $\hat{E}_k E_k$ and letting $k \rightarrow \infty$, we conclude with the help of (12.34), (12.36), (12.37), (12.38), (12.39), (11.1) and (11.9) that

$$(12.40) \quad \sum_{j=1}^q \ell_j \int_{B_{3/8} \cap \{x^2 \leq -2\tau\}} D\varphi_j \cdot D\zeta + \sum_{j=1}^q m_j \int_{B_{3/8} \cap \{x^2 \geq 2\tau\}} D\psi_j \cdot D\zeta + \eta(\tau) = 0$$

for any $\zeta \in C_c^2(B_{3/8})$ with $\frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial x^2} = 0$ in $\{x^2 < 2\tau\}$ and satisfying (12.20), where $\eta(\tau) \rightarrow 0$ as $\tau \rightarrow 0$.

It follows from (12.40) in the same way that (12.31) follows from (12.23) that if we let, for $Y \in B_{3/8} \cap (\{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1})$,

$$(12.41) \quad \Psi(Y) = \left(\sum_{j=1}^q (\ell_j + m_j) \right) \kappa_1(Y) - \left(\sum_{j=1}^q (\ell_j^2 + m_j^2) \right) \kappa_2(Y),$$

then Ψ is a C^2 function on $B_{9/32} \cap (\{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1})$ satisfying the estimate

$$(12.42) \quad \sup_{B_{9/32} \cap (\{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1})} |\Psi|^2 + |D_Y \Psi|^2 + |D_Y^2 \Psi|^2 \leq C \left(\int_{B_{1/2} \cap \{x^2 \leq 0\}} |\varphi|^2 + \int_{B_{1/2} \cap \{x^2 \geq 0\}} |\psi|^2 \right)$$

where $C = C(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty)$.

Note that $J \equiv 2q \sum_{j=1}^q (\ell_j^2 + m_j^2) - \left(\sum_{j=1}^q (\ell_j + m_j) \right)^2 = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=1}^q (m_i - m_j)^2 + (\ell_i - \ell_j)^2 + 2(\ell_i - m_j)^2$, and so it follows from (11.8) that $\tilde{C} \geq J \geq C > 0$, where $\tilde{C} = \tilde{C}(n, q) \in (0, \infty)$ and $C = C(n, q) \in (0, \infty)$; thus, by (12.30) and (12.41), we may express each of κ_1 and κ_2 as a linear combination of Φ and Ψ with coefficients, in absolute value, $\leq C = C(n, q) \in (0, \infty)$. Consequently, κ_1, κ_2 are in $C^2(B_{9/32} \cap (\{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1}))$ and, by (12.31) and (12.42), satisfy the estimates

$$(12.43) \quad \sup_{B_{9/32} \cap (\{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1})} |\kappa_i|^2 + |D_Y \kappa_i|^2 + |D_Y^2 \kappa_i|^2 \leq C \left(\int_{B_{1/2} \cap \{x^2 \leq 0\}} |\varphi|^2 + \int_{B_{1/2} \cap \{x^2 \geq 0\}} |\psi|^2 \right), \quad i = 1, 2,$$

where $C = C(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty)$. This in turn implies that for each $j = 1, 2, \dots, q$, the functions $\varphi_j|_{B_{9/32} \cap (\{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1})} (= \kappa_1 - \ell_j \kappa_2)$ and $\psi_j|_{B_{9/32} \cap (\{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1})} (= \kappa_1 - m_j \kappa_2)$ are in $C^2(B_{9/32} \cap (\{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1}))$ and satisfy the estimates

$$(12.44) \quad \sup_{B_{9/32} \cap (\{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1})} |\varphi_j|^2 + |D_Y \varphi_j|^2 + |D_Y^2 \varphi_j|^2 \leq C \left(\int_{B_{1/2} \cap \{x^2 \leq 0\}} |\varphi|^2 + \int_{B_{1/2} \cap \{x^2 \geq 0\}} |\psi|^2 \right) \quad \text{and}$$

$$(12.45) \quad \sup_{B_{9/32} \cap (\{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1})} |\psi_j|^2 + |D_Y \psi_j|^2 + |D_Y^2 \psi_j|^2 \leq C \left(\int_{B_{1/2} \cap \{x^2 \leq 0\}} |\varphi|^2 + \int_{B_{1/2} \cap \{x^2 \geq 0\}} |\psi|^2 \right)$$

where $C = C(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty)$. By Lemma 12.1 and the standard $C^{1,\alpha}$ boundary regularity theory for harmonic functions ([Mor66]), the desired conclusions of the present lemma in particular follow. $\square$

13. IMPROVEMENT OF FINE EXCESS

Let q be an integer ≥ 2 , $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and suppose that the induction hypotheses (H1), (H2) hold. The main result of this section (Lemma 13.3 below) establishes that there are fixed constants

$\epsilon = \epsilon(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, 1)$, $\gamma = \gamma(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, 1)$ such that whenever $V \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$, $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C}_q$ satisfy Hypotheses 10.1, Hypothesis $(\star)$ (of Section 10) with a suitable constant M depending only on n and q , the fine excess of V relative to a new cone $\mathbf{C}' \in \mathcal{C}_q$ decays by a fixed factor at one of several fixed smaller scales.

Lemma 13.1. *Let q be an integer ≥ 2 , $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $\theta \in (0, 1/4)$. There exist numbers $\bar{\epsilon} = \bar{\epsilon}(n, q, \alpha, \theta) \in (0, 1/2)$, $\bar{\gamma} = \bar{\gamma}(n, q, \alpha, \theta) \in (0, 1/2)$ and $\bar{\beta} = \bar{\beta}(n, q, \alpha, \theta) \in (0, 1/2)$ such that the following is true: If $V \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$, $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C}_q$ satisfy Hypotheses 10.1, Hypothesis $(\star)$, Hypothesis $(\star\star)$ (of Section 10) with $\epsilon = \bar{\epsilon}$, $\gamma = \bar{\gamma}$, $M = \frac{3}{2}M_0$, $\beta = \bar{\beta}$, and if the induction hypotheses $(H1)$, $(H2)$ hold, then there exist an orthogonal rotation Γ of $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ and a cone $\mathbf{C}' \in \mathcal{C}_q$ such that, with*

$$\hat{E}_V^2 = \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} |x^1|^2 d\|V\|(X) \quad \text{and} \quad E_V^2 = \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}\|) d\|V\|(X),$$

the following hold:

- (a) $|e_1 - \Gamma(e_1)| \leq \bar{\kappa} E_V$ and $|e_j - \Gamma(e_j)| \leq \bar{\kappa} \hat{E}_V^{-1} E_V$ for each $j = 2, 3, \dots, n+1$;
- (b) $\text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}^2(\text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}'\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1), \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1)) \leq \bar{\mathcal{C}}_0 E_V^2$;
- (c)
$$\begin{aligned} & \theta^{-n-2} \int_{\Gamma(\mathbf{R} \times (B_{\theta/2} \setminus \{|x^2| \leq \theta/16\}))} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|V\|) d\|\Gamma_{\#} \mathbf{C}'\|(X) \\ & + \theta^{-n-2} \int_{\Gamma(\mathbf{R} \times B_{\theta})} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\Gamma_{\#} \mathbf{C}'\|) d\|V\|(X) \leq \bar{\nu} \theta^2 E_V^2; \end{aligned}$$
- (d)
$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\theta^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_{\theta}} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|\Gamma_{\#}^{-1} V\|(X) \right)^{1/2} \\ & \geq 2^{-\frac{n+4}{2}} \sqrt{\bar{\mathcal{C}}_1} \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1), P \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1)) - \bar{\mathcal{C}}_2 E_V \end{aligned}$$
 for any $P \in G_n$ of the form $P = \{x^1 = \lambda x^2\}$ for some $\lambda \in (-1, 1)$;
- (e) $\{Z : \Theta(\|\Gamma_{\#}^{-1} V\|, Z) \geq q\} \cap (\mathbf{R} \times (B_{\theta/2} \cap \{|x^2| < \theta/16\})) = \emptyset$;
- (f) $(\omega_n \theta^n)^{-1} \|\Gamma_{\#}^{-1} V\|(\mathbf{R} \times B_{\theta}) < q + 1/2$.

Here the constants $\bar{\kappa}, \bar{\mathcal{C}}_0, \bar{\nu}, \bar{\mathcal{C}}_2 \in (0, \infty)$ each depends only on n, q, α and $\bar{\mathcal{C}}_1 = \bar{\mathcal{C}}_1(n) = \int_{B_{1/2} \cap \{x^2 > 1/16\}} |x^2|^2 d\mathcal{H}^n(x^2, y)$.

Proof. Consider any sequence of varifolds $\{V_k\} \subset \mathcal{S}_\alpha$ and any sequence of cones $\{\mathbf{C}_k\} \subset \mathcal{C}_q$ satisfying, for each $k = 1, 2, \dots$, hypotheses $(1_k) - (7_k)$ of Section 11 for some sequences $\{\epsilon_k\}, \{\gamma_k\}, \{\beta_k\}$ of numbers with $\epsilon_k, \gamma_k, \beta_k \rightarrow 0^+$, where hypothesis (6_k) holds with M_0 in place of M_0^3 . The lemma will be established by showing that for each of infinitely many k , there exist an orthogonal rotation Γ_k of $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ and a cone $\mathbf{C}'_k \in \mathcal{C}_q$ such that the conclusions of the lemma hold with $V_k, \mathbf{C}_k, \mathbf{C}'_k$ in place of $V, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{C}'$ respectively, for fixed constants $\bar{\kappa}, \bar{\mathcal{C}}_0, \bar{\gamma}_0, \bar{\nu}, \bar{\mathcal{C}}_1, \bar{\mathcal{C}}_2 \in (0, \infty)$ depending only on n, q and α .

Let $\hat{E}_k = \hat{E}_{V_k}$ and $E_k = E_{V_k}$. For $i = 1, 2, \dots, (n-1)$, let $Y_i = \frac{1}{2}\theta e_{2+i} \in \{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1}$. We infer from (11.2) that passing to a subsequence of $\{k\}$ without changing notation, for each $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$, there exist points $Z_{i,k} = (\zeta_1^{i,k}, \zeta_2^{i,k}, \eta_{i,k}) \in \text{spt } \|V_k\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1)$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, (n-1)$, such that $\Theta(\|V_k\|, Z_{i,k}) \geq q$ and $|Z_{i,k} - Y_i| \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$; also, we may find orthogonal rotations Γ'_k of $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ such that

$$\Gamma'_k(\Sigma_k) = \{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma'_k \left(\frac{Z_{i,k}}{|Z_{i,k}|} \right) \rightarrow e_{2+i} \quad \text{for each } i = 1, 2, \dots, (n-1),$$

where Σ_k is the $(n-1)$ -dimensional subspace spanned by $\{Z_{i,k} : i = 1, 2, \dots, (n-1)\}$. Let Γ_k'' be the orthogonal rotation of $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ such that $\Gamma_k''(Y) = Y$ for each $Y \in \{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1}$ and $\Gamma_k''\left(\frac{\pi_{12}\Gamma_k'(e_1)}{|\pi_{12}\Gamma_k'(e_1)|}\right) = e_1$, where $\pi_{12} : \mathbf{R}^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^2 \times \{0\}$ is the orthogonal projection onto the x^1x^2 -plane, and let

$$\Gamma_k = \Gamma_k'' \circ \Gamma_k', \text{ so that}$$

$$(13.1) \quad \Gamma_k(\Sigma_k) = \{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1}, \quad \Gamma_k\left(\frac{Z_{i,k}}{|Z_{i,k}|}\right) \rightarrow e_{2+i} \text{ for each } i = 1, 2, \dots, (n-1).$$

Let $(\varphi, \psi) \in \mathcal{B}^F$ be the fine blow-up of a subsequence of $\{V_k\}$ relative to the corresponding subsequence of $\{\mathbf{C}_k\}$. Since $\Theta(\|V_k\|, 0) \geq 0$, it follows from (11.6) that $\varphi(0) = \psi(0) = 0$, and consequently, from (12.2) and (12.43) that after passing to further subsequences without changing notation,

$$(13.2) \quad |\zeta_1^{i,k}| + \hat{E}_k |\zeta_2^{i,k}| \leq C\theta E_k$$

for each $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$ and $k = 1, 2, \dots$, where $C = C(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty)$; with the help of (13.2), the following can then be verified:

$$(13.3) \quad |e_1 - \Gamma_k(e_1)| \leq CE_k \quad \text{and} \quad |e_j - \Gamma_k(e_j)| \leq C\hat{E}_k^{-1}E_k, \quad j = 2, 3, \dots, n+1,$$

where $C = C(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty)$. Note in particular that C here is independent of θ . Consequently, letting $\tilde{V}_k = \eta_{0,7/8\sharp}(\Gamma_k\sharp V_k)$ and passing to a further subsequence without changing notation, we have for each $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$ that

$$(13.4) \quad d_{\mathcal{H}}(\Gamma_k^{-1}(\{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^n) \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1), \{0\} \times B_1) \leq CE_k,$$

$$(13.5) \quad E_{\tilde{V}_k}^2 \equiv \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}_k\|) d\|\tilde{V}_k\|(X) \leq CE_k^2 \quad \text{and},$$

$$(13.6) \quad \tilde{C}\hat{E}_k \leq \hat{E}_{\tilde{V}_k} \leq C\hat{E}_k$$

where $\tilde{C} = \tilde{C}(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty)$ and $C = C(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty)$. Note that the first inequality in (13.6) depends on the fact that

$$(13.7) \quad \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_{7/8}} |x^1|^2 d\|V_k\|(X) \geq c\hat{E}_k^2$$

where $c = c(n, q) \in (0, 1)$, which in turn is a consequence of the fact that the coarse blow-up $v_\star$ of $\{V_k\}$ (by the excess $\hat{E}_k$) is homogeneous of degree 1 (in fact its graph is a union of half-hyperplanes meeting along $\{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1}$) and satisfies, by (11.7), $\int_{B_1} |v_\star|^2 \geq \tilde{c}$, $\tilde{c} = \tilde{c}(n, q) \in (0, 1)$; thus, for each $\sigma \in (0, 1)$, $\sigma^{-n-2} \int_{B_\sigma} |v_\star|^2 = \int_{B_1} |v_\star|^2 \geq \tilde{c}$, so that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_\sigma} |x^1|^2 d\|V_k\|(X) &= \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_\sigma} \sqrt{1 + |Du_k^j|^2} |u_k^j|^2 - \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{\Sigma_k} \sqrt{1 + |Du_k^j|^2} |u_k^j|^2 \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathbf{R} \times \Sigma_k} |x^1|^2 d\|V_k\|(X) \\ &\geq \int_{B_\sigma} |u_k|^2 - 2C_\sigma \left(\sup_{B_\sigma} |u_k|^2 \right) \hat{E}_k^2 \\ &\geq \left(\frac{1}{2} \tilde{c} \sigma^{n+2} - 2C_\sigma \left(\sup_{B_\sigma} |u_k|^2 \right) \right) \hat{E}_k^2 \geq \frac{1}{4} \tilde{c} \sigma^{n+2} \hat{E}_k^2 \end{aligned}$$

for sufficiently large k , where u_k, Σ_k correspond to u, Σ of Theorem 5.1 taken with V_k in place of V and the constant C_σ is the same as the constant C of Theorem 5.1(a). With $\sigma = 7/8$, this gives (13.7).

Passing to another subsequence without changing notation, we see using Theorem 5.1, (11.5) and (13.4), (13.6) that hypotheses (1_k)-(7_k) of Section 11 are satisfied for each $k = 1, 2, \dots$ with $\tilde{V}_k$ in place of V_k , suitable numbers $\tilde{\epsilon}_k, \tilde{\gamma}_k, \tilde{\beta}_k \rightarrow 0^+$ in place of $\epsilon_k, \gamma_k, \beta_k$ respectively and with M_0^2 in place of M_0^3 in (6_k); in verifying (7_k), we use the fact that $Q_{\tilde{V}_k}^*(p_k - 1) \geq CQ_{V_k}^*(p_k - 1)$, $C = C(n, q) \in (0, \infty)$, which in turn follows from (13.3) and the fact that, for any $\mathbf{C} \in \cup_{j=4}^{p_k-1} \mathcal{C}_q(j)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbf{R} \times (B_{7/16} \setminus \{|x^2| \leq 7/(8 \cdot 16)\})} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|V_k\|) d\|\mathbf{C}\|(X) \\ & + \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_{7/8}} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}\|) d\|V_k\|(X) \geq \tilde{c}_1 (Q_{V_k}^*(p_k - 1))^2 \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{c}_1 = \tilde{c}_1(n, q) \in (0, 1)$. This last estimate can be justified by reasoning as in the proof of (13.7), using the fact that the blow-up of $\{V_k\}$ by $Q_{V_k}^*(p_k - 1)$ is homogeneous of degree 1 (by hypothesis (7_k)) and has, by (10.3), $L^2(B_1)$ norm $\geq c$, $c = c(n, q) \in (0, 1)$. To verify that (6_k) is satisfied with $\tilde{V}_k$ in place of V and M_0^2 in place of M_0^3 , note first that by (13.6),

$$\inf_{P=\{x^1=\lambda x^2\}} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|\tilde{V}_k\|(X) = \inf_{P=\{x^1=\lambda x^2\}; |\lambda| \leq C\hat{E}_k} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|\tilde{V}_k\|(X)$$

where $C = C(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty)$, and that for any hyperplane $P = \{x^1 = \lambda x^2\}$ with $|\lambda| < C\hat{E}_k$ and for sufficiently large k ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|\tilde{V}_k\|(X) \geq \left(\frac{4}{7}\right)^{n+2} 2^{n+2} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_{1/2}} \text{dist}^2(X, \Gamma_k(P)) d\|V_k\|(X) \\ & \geq 7^{-n-2} 2^n \omega_n^{-1} (2q+1)^{-1} \bar{C}_1 \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, \Gamma_k(P)) d\|V_k\|(X) - CE_V^2 \\ & \geq 7^{-n-2} 2^{n-1} \omega_n^{-1} (2q+1)^{-1} \bar{C}_1 \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|V_k\|(X) \\ & \quad - C \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}^2(\Gamma_k(P) \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1), P \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1)) - CE_V^2 \\ & \geq 7^{-n-2} 2^n \omega_n^{-1} (2q+1)^{-1} \bar{C}_1 \left(\frac{3}{2} M_0\right)^{-1} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} |x^1|^2 d\|V_k\|(X) - CE_k^2 \end{aligned}$$

where $C = C(n, q) \in (0, \infty)$, the second inequality follows from (10.15) with $\rho = 1/2$ and $Z = 0$, and the last inequality holds by hypothesis of the present lemma. On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} |x^1|^2 d\|\tilde{V}_k\|(X) \leq 2 \left(\frac{8}{7}\right)^{n+2} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} |x^1|^2 d\|V_k\|(X) \\ & \quad + \left(\frac{8}{7}\right)^{n+2} \omega_n (2q+1) \text{dist}^2(\Gamma_k(\{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^n) \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1), \{0\} \times B_1) \\ & \leq 2 \left(\frac{8}{7}\right)^{n+2} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} |x^1|^2 d\|V_k\|(X) + CE_k^2 \end{aligned}$$

where $C = C(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty)$. Hence

$$\hat{E}_{V_k}^2 \leq \frac{3M_0}{2(2^{-2n-7} \omega_n^{-1} (2q+1)^{-1} \bar{C}_1 - C\gamma_k)} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|\tilde{V}_k\|(X)$$

where $C = C(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty)$, and it follows from this that hypothesis (6_k) with $\tilde{V}_k$ in place of V_k and M_0^2 in place of M_0^3 is satisfied for all sufficiently large k .

Thus, the fine blow-up $(\tilde{\varphi}, \tilde{\psi})$ of $\{\tilde{V}_k\}$ relative to $\{\mathbf{C}_k\}$ belongs to $\mathcal{B}^F$. Furthermore, it follows from (13.1) and (11.6) (applied with $\tilde{V}_k$ in place of V_k and $\frac{8}{7}\Gamma_k Z_{i,k}$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$, in place of Z) that for each $i = 1, 2, \dots, (n-1)$, $\tilde{\varphi}(Y_i) = \tilde{\psi}(Y_i) = 0$ and consequently, since $Y_i = \frac{1}{2}\theta e_{i+2}$, that there exist points $S_{j,i}, T_{j,i} \in B_{\theta/2} \cap (\{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1})$ such that

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{\varphi}_j}{\partial y^i}(S_{j,i}) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial \tilde{\psi}_j}{\partial y^i}(T_{j,i}) = 0$$

for each $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$ and $j = 1, 2, \dots, q$. By the estimate of Theorem 12.2, this readily implies (13.8)

$$|D_y \tilde{\varphi}(0)|^2 + |D_y \tilde{\psi}(0)|^2 \leq C\theta^2 \left(\int_{B_{1/2} \cap \{x^2 < 0\}} |\tilde{\varphi}|^2 + \int_{B_{1/2} \cap \{x^2 > 0\}} |\tilde{\psi}|^2 \right), \quad C = C(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty).$$

Letting, for $j = 1, 2, \dots, q$ and $x = (x^2, y) \in \mathbf{R}^n$,

$$L_{\tilde{\varphi}}^j(x) = D\tilde{\varphi}_j(0) \cdot x, \quad L_{\tilde{\psi}}^j(x) = D\tilde{\psi}_j(0) \cdot x, \quad P_{\tilde{\varphi}}^j(x^2, y) = \frac{\partial \tilde{\varphi}_j}{\partial x^2}(0)x^2 \quad \text{and} \quad P_{\tilde{\psi}}^j(x) = \frac{\partial \tilde{\psi}_j}{\partial x^2}(0)x^2,$$

it follows from (13.8) that for each $(x^2, y) \in \mathbf{R}^n$,

$$\begin{aligned} & |P_{\tilde{\varphi}}^j(x^2, y) - L_{\tilde{\varphi}}^j(x^2, y)|^2 + |P_{\tilde{\psi}}^j(x^2, y) - L_{\tilde{\psi}}^j(x^2, y)|^2 \\ & \leq C\theta^2 |y|^2 \left(\int_{B_{1/2} \cap \{x^2 < 0\}} |\tilde{\varphi}|^2 + \int_{B_{1/2} \cap \{x^2 > 0\}} |\tilde{\psi}|^2 \right) \end{aligned}$$

and consequently from Theorem 12.2 that

$$(13.9) \quad \theta^{-n-2} \left(\int_{B_{2\theta} \cap \{x^2 \leq 0\}} |\tilde{\varphi} - P_{\tilde{\varphi}}|^2 + \int_{B_{2\theta} \cap \{x^2 \geq 0\}} |\tilde{\psi} - P_{\tilde{\psi}}|^2 \right) \leq C\theta^2, \quad C = C(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty).$$

For $j = 1, 2, \dots, q$ and $k = 1, 2, \dots$, let

$$(13.10) \quad \lambda_j'^k = \lambda_j^k + E_{\tilde{V}_k} \frac{\partial \tilde{\varphi}_j}{\partial x^2}(0), \quad \mu_j'^k = \mu_j^k + E_{\tilde{V}_k} \frac{\partial \tilde{\psi}_j}{\partial x^2}(0),$$

$$H_j'^k = \{(x^1, x^2, y) : x^1 = \lambda_j'^k x^2, \quad x^2 \leq 0\}, \quad G_j'^k = \{(x^1, x^2, y) : x^1 = \mu_j'^k x^2, \quad x^2 \geq 0\} \quad \text{and}$$

$$\mathbf{C}'_k = \sum_{j=1}^q |H_j'^k| + |G_j'^k|.$$

With the help of (13.9), (11.3), (13.5), it is straight forward to verified that

$$(13.11) \quad \theta^{-n-2} \int_{\Gamma_k^{-1}(\mathbf{R} \times B_\theta)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt} \|(\Gamma_k^{-1})_\# \mathbf{C}'_k\|) d\|V_k\|(X) \leq C\theta^2 E_k^2$$

for all sufficiently large k , where $\mathbf{C}'_k$ is as above and Γ_k is as in (13), and $C = C(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty)$. Furthermore, it follows from (13.5), (13.10) and Theorem 12.2 that

$$(13.12) \quad \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}^2(\text{spt} \|\mathbf{C}'_k\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1), \text{spt} \|\mathbf{C}_k\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1)) \leq CE_k^2, \quad C = C(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty),$$

and from (11.4) (applied with $\tilde{V}_k$ in place of V_k) that

$$(13.13) \quad \begin{aligned} & \theta^{-n-2} \int_{\Gamma_k^{-1}(\mathbf{R} \times (B_{\theta/2} \setminus \{|x^2| \leq \theta/16\}))} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|V_k\|) d\|\Gamma_k^{-1} \mathbf{C}'_k\|(X) \\ & \leq C \theta^{-n-2} \int_{\Gamma_k^{-1}(\mathbf{R} \times B_\theta)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\Gamma_k^{-1} \mathbf{C}'_k\|) d\|V_k\|(X), \quad C = C(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty). \end{aligned}$$

Again by (11.4) (applied with $\tilde{V}_k$ in place of V_k), (13.5) and (13.11), we have that for any hyperplane P of the form $P = \{x^1 = \lambda x^2\}$, $|\lambda| < 1$, writing $\tilde{\theta} = \frac{8}{7}\theta$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \tilde{\theta}^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_{\tilde{\theta}}} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|\tilde{V}_k\|(X) \\ & \geq \frac{1}{2} \tilde{\theta}^{-n-2} \sum_{j=1}^q \left(\int_{B_{\tilde{\theta}/2} \cap \{x^2 < -\tilde{\theta}/16\}} |h_j^k - \lambda x^2 + \tilde{u}_j^k|^2 + \int_{B_{\tilde{\theta}/2} \cap \{x^2 > \tilde{\theta}/16\}} |g_j^k - \lambda x^2 + \tilde{w}_j^k|^2 \right) \\ & \geq \frac{1}{4} \tilde{\theta}^{-n-2} \sum_{j=1}^q \left(\int_{B_{\tilde{\theta}/2} \cap \{x^2 < -\tilde{\theta}/16\}} |h_j^k - \lambda x^2|^2 + \int_{B_{\tilde{\theta}/2} \cap \{x^2 > \tilde{\theta}/16\}} |g_j^k - \lambda x^2|^2 \right) \\ & \quad - \frac{1}{2} \tilde{\theta}^{-n-2} \sum_{j=1}^q \left(\int_{B_{\tilde{\theta}/2} \cap \{x^2 < -\tilde{\theta}/16\}} |\tilde{u}_j^k|^2 + \int_{B_{\tilde{\theta}/2} \cap \{x^2 > \tilde{\theta}/16\}} |\tilde{w}_j^k|^2 \right) \\ & \geq 2^{-n-4} \overline{C}_1 \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}^2(\text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}_k\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1), P \cap (\mathbf{R} \times \times B_1)) \\ & \quad - \frac{1}{2} \tilde{\theta}^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_{\tilde{\theta}}} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}_k\|) d\|\tilde{V}_k\|(X) \\ & \geq 2^{-n-4} \overline{C}_1 \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}^2(\text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}_k\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1), P \cap (\mathbf{R} \times \times B_1)) \\ & \quad - \tilde{\theta}^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_{\tilde{\theta}}} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}'_k\|) d\|\tilde{V}_k\|(X) - C E_k^2 \\ & \geq 2^{-n-4} \overline{C}_1 \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}^2(\text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}_k\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1), P \cap (\mathbf{R} \times \times B_1)) - C E_k^2 \end{aligned}$$

where $\overline{C}_1 = \int_{B_{1/2} \cap \{x^2 > 1/16\}} |x^2|^2 d\mathcal{H}^n(x^2, y)$, $C_2 = C_2(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty)$ and the notation is as in Theorem 10.1 taken with $\tilde{V}_k$ in place of V (in particular with $\tilde{u}_k^j, \tilde{w}_k^j$ corresponding to u^j, w^j). This readily implies that

$$(13.14) \quad \begin{aligned} & \left(\theta^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_\theta} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|\Gamma_k^{-1} \mathbf{C}'_k\|(X) \right)^{1/2} \\ & \geq 2^{-\frac{n+4}{2}} \sqrt{\overline{C}_1} \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}_k\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1), P \cap (\mathbf{R} \times \times B_1)) - C E_k \end{aligned}$$

for each hyperplane $P = \{x^1 = \lambda x^2\}$ with $|\lambda| < 1$ and all sufficiently large k , where $C = C(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty)$.

The inequalities (13.3) and (13.11)-(13.14) say that the conclusions (a)-(d) of the lemma, with $V_k, \mathbf{C}_k, \mathbf{C}'_k, \Gamma_k^{-1}$ in place of $V, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{C}', \Gamma$, hold for all sufficiently large k . Conclusion (e) with V_k in place of V and Γ_k^{-1} in place of Γ is clear, for all sufficiently large k , by (11.5) applied with $\tilde{V}_k$ in place of V_k . Conclusion (f) with V_k in place of V and Γ_k^{-1} in place of Γ follows, for sufficiently large k , from the Constancy Theorem for stationary integral varifolds and the fact that $q \leq \Theta(\|\tilde{V}_k\|, 0) \leq (\omega_n 2^n)^{-1} \|\tilde{V}_k\|(B_2^{n+1}(0)) < q + 1/2$ for each k . $\square$

Lemma 13.2. *Let $q \geq 2$ be an integer, $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $p \in \{4, 5, \dots, 2q\}$. For $j = 1, 2, \dots, p-3$, let $\theta_j \in (0, 1/4)$ be such that $\theta_1 > 8\theta_2 > 64\theta_3 > \dots > 8^{p-4}\theta_{p-3}$. There exist numbers $\epsilon^{(p)} = \epsilon^{(p)}(n, q, \alpha, \theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_{p-3}) \in (0, 1/2)$, $\gamma^{(p)} = \gamma^{(p)}(n, q, \alpha, \theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_{p-3}) \in (0, 1/2)$ such that if $V \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$, $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C}_q(p)$ satisfy Hypotheses 10.1, Hypothesis $(\star)$ (of Section 10) with $\epsilon = \epsilon^{(p)}$, $\gamma = \gamma^{(p)}$, $M = \frac{3}{2}M_0$ and if the induction hypotheses (H1), (H2) hold, then there exist an orthogonal rotation Γ of $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ and a cone $\mathbf{C}' \in \mathcal{C}_q$ such that, with*

$$\hat{E}_V^2 = \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} |x^1|^2 d\|V\|(X) \quad \text{and}$$

$$Q_V^2(\mathbf{C}) = \int_{\mathbf{R} \times (B_{1/2} \setminus \{|x^2| < 1/16\})} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|V\|) d\|\mathbf{C}\|(X) + \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}\|) d\|V\|(X),$$

we have the following:

$$(a) \quad |e_1 - \Gamma(e_1)| \leq \kappa^{(p)} Q_V(\mathbf{C}) \quad \text{and} \quad |e_j - \Gamma(e_j)| \leq \kappa^{(p)} \hat{E}_V^{-1} Q_V(\mathbf{C}) \quad \text{for each } j = 2, 3, \dots, n+1;$$

$$(b) \quad \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}^2(\text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}'\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1), \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1)) \leq C_0^{(p)} Q_V^2(\mathbf{C});$$

and for some $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, p-3\}$,

$$(c) \quad \theta_j^{-n-2} \int_{\Gamma(\mathbf{R} \times (B_{\theta_j/2} \setminus \{|x^2| \leq \theta_j/16\}))} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|V\|) d\|\Gamma_{\#} \mathbf{C}'\|(X) \\ + \theta_j^{-n-2} \int_{\Gamma(\mathbf{R} \times B_{\theta_j})} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\Gamma_{\#} \mathbf{C}'\|) d\|V\|(X) \leq \nu_j^{(p)} \theta_j^2 Q_V^2(\mathbf{C});$$

$$(d) \quad \left(\theta_j^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_{\theta_j}} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|\Gamma_{\#}^{-1} V\|(X) \right)^{1/2} \\ \geq 2^{-\frac{n+4}{2}} \sqrt{\overline{C}_1} \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1), P \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1)) - C_2^{(p)} Q_V(\mathbf{C})$$

for any $P \in G_n$ of the form $P = \{x^1 = \lambda x^2\}$ for some $\lambda \in (-1, 1)$;

$$(e) \quad \{Z : \Theta(\|\Gamma_{\#}^{-1} V\|, Z) \geq q\} \cap (\mathbf{R} \times (B_{\theta_j/2} \cap \{|x^2| < \theta_j/16\})) = \emptyset;$$

$$(f) \quad (\omega_n \theta_j^n)^{-1} \|\Gamma_{\#}^{-1} V\|(\mathbf{R} \times B_{\theta_j}) < q + 1/2.$$

Here the dependence of the various constants on the parameters is as follows:

$\kappa^{(p)} = \kappa^{(p)}(n, q, \alpha, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_{p-4})$, $C_0^{(p)} = C_0^{(p)}(n, q, \alpha, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_{p-4})$, $C_2^{(p)} = C_2^{(p)}(n, q, \alpha, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_{p-4})$ in case $q \geq 3$ and $p \in \{5, 6, \dots, 2q\}$; $\kappa^{(4)} = \bar{\kappa}$, $C_0^{(4)} = \overline{C}_0$, $C_2^{(4)} = \overline{C}_2$, where $\bar{\kappa} = \bar{\kappa}(n, q, \alpha)$, $\overline{C}_0 = \overline{C}_0(n, q, \alpha)$, $\overline{C}_2 = \overline{C}_2(n, q, \alpha)$ are as in Lemma 13.1; $\nu_1^{(p)} = \bar{\nu}$, where $\bar{\nu} = \bar{\nu}(n, q, \alpha)$ is as in Lemma 13.1; and, in case $q \geq 3$, for each $j = 2, 3, \dots, p-3$, $\nu_j^{(p)} = \nu_j^{(p)}(n, q, \alpha, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_{j-1})$. In particular, $\nu_j^{(p)}$ is independent of $\theta_j, \theta_{j+1}, \dots, \theta_{p-3}$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, p-3$.

Proof. If $p = 4$ then we may simply set $\epsilon^{(4)}(n, q, \alpha, \theta_1) = \bar{\epsilon}(n, q, \alpha, \theta_1)$ and $\gamma^{(4)}(n, q, \alpha, \theta_1) = \bar{\gamma}(n, q, \alpha, \theta_1)$, where $\bar{\epsilon}, \bar{\gamma}$ are as in Lemma 13.1, and deduce from Lemma 13.1 with $\theta = \theta_1$ that there exist a cone $\mathbf{C}' \in \mathcal{C}_q$ and an orthogonal rotation Γ of $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ such that the conclusions of the lemma hold with $j = 1$ in (d)-(g); with $\kappa^{(4)} = \bar{\kappa}$, $C_0^{(4)} = \overline{C}_0$, $C_2^{(4)} = \overline{C}_2$ and $\nu_1^{(4)} = \bar{\nu}$, where $\bar{\kappa}_j, \overline{C}_0, \overline{C}_2, \bar{\nu}$ are as in Lemma 13.1. Thus the lemma holds if $p = 4$.

Else $q \geq 3$ and $p \in \{5, 6, \dots, 2q\}$. Assume by induction the validity of the lemma with any $p' \in \{4, 5, \dots, p-1\}$ in place of p . Let $\theta_j \in (0, 1/4)$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, p-3$ be given such that $\theta_1 > 8\theta_2 > 64\theta_3 > \dots > 8^{p-4}\theta_{p-3}$. To prove the lemma as stated, it suffices to show that for

arbitrary sequences $\{V_k\} \subset \mathcal{S}_\alpha$, $\{\mathbf{C}_k\} \subset \mathcal{C}_q(p)$ that satisfy hypotheses $(1_k) - (5_k)$ of Section 11 as well as hypothesis (6_k) of Section 11 with M_0 in place of M_0^2 , there exist a subsequence $\{k'\}$ of $\{k\}$ and, for each k' , a cone $\mathbf{C}'_{k'} \in \mathcal{C}_q$ and an orthogonal rotation $\Gamma_{k'}$ of $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ such that the conclusions of the lemma hold with $V_{k'}$, $\mathbf{C}_{k'}$, $\mathbf{C}'_{k'}$, $\Gamma_{k'}$ in place of V , $\mathbf{C}$, $\mathbf{C}'$, Γ respectively, and with suitable constants $\kappa^{(p)}$, $C_0^{(p)}$, $C_2^{(p)}$ and $\nu_1^{(p)}, \dots, \nu_{p-3}^{(p)}$ depending only on the parameters as specified in the statement of the lemma.

So suppose, for $k = 1, 2, \dots$, $V_k \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$, $\mathbf{C}_k \in \mathcal{C}_q(p)$ satisfy hypotheses $(1_k) - (6_k)$ of Section 11 with M_0 in place of M_0^2 . For each k , choose a cone $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_k \in \cup_{j=4}^{p-1} \mathcal{C}_q(j)$ such that

$$(13.15) \quad \begin{aligned} (\tilde{Q}_k)^2 &\equiv \left(\int_{\mathbf{R} \times (B_{1/2} \setminus \{|x^2| < 1/16\})} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|V_k\|) d\|\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_k\|(X) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_k\|) d\|V_k\|(X) \right) \leq \frac{3}{2} (Q_k^*)^2 \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} (Q_k^*)^2 &= \inf_{\tilde{\mathbf{C}} \in \cup_{j=4}^{p-1} \mathcal{C}_q(j)} \left(\int_{\mathbf{R} \times (B_{1/2} \setminus \{|x^2| < 1/16\})} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|V_k\|) d\|\tilde{\mathbf{C}}\|(X) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\tilde{\mathbf{C}}\|) d\|V_k\|(X) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Let $\beta = \bar{\beta}(n, q, \alpha, \theta_1)$ where $\bar{\beta}$ is as in Lemma 13.1, and consider the following two alternatives:

(A) for infinitely many k ,

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbf{R} \times (B_{1/2} \setminus \{|x^2| < 1/16\})} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|V_k\|) d\|\mathbf{C}_k\|(X) \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}_k\|) d\|V_k\|(X) < \beta (Q_k^*)^2 \end{aligned}$$

(B) for all sufficiently large k ,

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbf{R} \times (B_{1/2} \setminus \{|x^2| < 1/16\})} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|V_k\|) d\|\mathbf{C}_k\|(X) \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}_k\|) d\|V_k\|(X) \geq \beta (Q_k^*)^2. \end{aligned}$$

If alternative (A) holds, we deduce directly from Lemma 13.1, applied with $\theta = \theta_1$, that for infinitely many k , there exit a cone $\mathbf{C}'_k \in \mathcal{C}_q$ and an orthogonal rotation Γ_k of $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ such that the conclusions of the present lemma hold with V_k , $\mathbf{C}_k$, $\mathbf{C}'_k$, Γ_k in place of V , $\mathbf{C}$, $\mathbf{C}'$, Γ ; with $j = 1$ in the conclusions (c)-(f); and with $\bar{\kappa}$, $\bar{C}_0$, $\bar{C}_2$, $\bar{\nu}$ (as in Lemma 13.1) in place of $\kappa^{(p)}$, $C_2^{(p)}$, $\nu_1^{(p)}$.

If alternative (B) holds, we have by hypothesis (5_k) and (13.15) that for all sufficiently large k ,

$$(13.16) \quad \begin{aligned} &\left(\int_{\mathbf{R} \times (B_{1/2} \setminus \{|x^2| < 1/16\})} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|V_k\|) d\|\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_k\|(X) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_k\|) d\|V_k\|(X) \right) \leq \frac{3\gamma_k}{2\beta} \hat{E}_k^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_k \in \mathcal{C}_q(p')$ for some $p' \in \{4, 5, \dots, p-1\}$ and infinitely many k , we may, by the induction hypothesis, apply the lemma with p' in place of p and $\theta_2, \theta_3, \dots, \theta_{p'-2}$ in place of $\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_{p-3}$

to deduce that for infinitely many k , there exist a cone $\mathbf{C}'_k \in \mathcal{C}_q$ and an orthogonal rotation Γ_k of $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ such that the conclusions (a)-(f) hold with $V_k, \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_k, \mathbf{C}'_k, \Gamma_k$ in place of $V, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{C}', \Gamma$ —in particular with $\tilde{Q}_k$ in place of $Q_V(\mathbf{C})$ —and such that:

- (i) in case $p' = 4$ (which must be the case if $p = 5$), with $\kappa^{(4)} = \bar{\kappa}$, $C_0^{(4)} = \bar{C}_0$, $C_2^{(4)} = \bar{C}_2$ and $\nu_1^{(4)} = \bar{\nu}$ (where $\bar{\kappa}, \bar{C}_0, \bar{C}_1, \bar{C}_2, \bar{\nu}$ are as in Lemma 13.1 and C is as in Theorem 10.2(a)), and
- (ii) in case $p' \in \{5, 6, \dots, p-1\}$ (possible, of course, only if $p \geq 6$) with

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa^{(p')} &= \kappa^{(p')}(n, q, \alpha, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_{p'-3}), \quad C_0^{(p')} = C_0^{(p')}(n, q, \alpha, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_{p'-3}), \\ C_2^{(p')} &= C_2^{(p')}(n, q, \alpha, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_{p'-3}) \end{aligned}$$

in place of $\kappa^{(p)}, C_0^{(p)}, C_2^{(p)}$ respectively; with $\nu_1^{(p')}(n, q, \alpha) = \bar{\nu}$ (where $\bar{\nu}$ is as in Lemma 13.1) in place of $\nu_1^{(p)}$; and with

$$\nu_{j-1}^{(p')}(n, q, \alpha, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_{j-1})$$

in place of $\nu_{j-1}^{(p)}$ for each $j = 3, \dots, p' - 2$.

Since by (13.15) and the definition of alternative (B) we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{Q}_k^2 &\leq \frac{3}{2\beta} \left(\int_{\mathbf{R} \times (B_{1/2} \setminus \{|x^2| < 1/16\})} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|V_k\|) d\|\mathbf{C}_k\|(X) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}_k\|) d\|V_k\|(X) \right), \end{aligned}$$

and $\text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}^2(\text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}_k\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1), \text{spt } \|\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_k\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1)) \leq \bar{C}(\tilde{Q}_k^2 + Q_k^2)$, where $\bar{C} = \bar{C}(n, q) \in (0, \infty)$, setting

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa^{(5)}(n, q, \alpha, \theta_1) &= \frac{3\bar{\kappa}}{2\bar{\beta}(n, q, \alpha, \theta_1)}, \quad C_0^{(5)}(n, q, \alpha, \theta_1) = 2\bar{C} + \frac{3(\bar{C} + \bar{C}_0)}{\bar{\beta}(n, q, \alpha, \theta_1)}, \\ C_2^{(5)}(n, q, \alpha, \theta_1) &= 2^{-\frac{n+4}{2}} \sqrt{\bar{C}_1 \bar{C}} + \left(2^{-\frac{n+4}{2}} \sqrt{\bar{C}_1 \bar{C}} + \bar{C}_2 \right) \sqrt{\frac{3}{2\bar{\beta}(n, q, \alpha, \theta_1)}}, \\ \nu_1^{(5)}(n, q, \alpha) &= \bar{\nu}, \quad \nu_2^{(5)}(n, q, \alpha, \theta_1) = \frac{3\bar{\nu}}{2\bar{\beta}(n, q, \alpha, \theta_1)}, \end{aligned}$$

and, for $p \geq 6$,

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa^{(p)}(n, q, \alpha, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_{p-4}) &= \\ \max \left\{ \bar{\kappa}, \frac{3}{2\bar{\beta}(n, q, \alpha, \theta_1)} \kappa^{(p')}(n, q, \alpha, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_{p'-3}) : p' = 5, \dots, p-1 \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} C_0^{(p)}(n, q, \alpha, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_{p-4}) &= \\ \max \left\{ \bar{C}_0, 2\bar{C} + \frac{3}{\bar{\beta}(n, q, \alpha, \theta_1)} \left(\bar{C} + C_0^{(p')}(n, q, \alpha, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_{p'-3}) \right) : p' = 5, \dots, p-1 \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} C_2^{(p)}(n, q, \alpha, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_{p-4}) &= \\ \max \left\{ \bar{C}_2, a + \sqrt{\frac{3}{2\bar{\beta}(n, q, \alpha, \theta_1)}} \left(a + C_2^{(p')}(n, q, \alpha, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_{p'-3}) \right) : p' = 5, \dots, p-1 \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $a = 2^{-\frac{n+4}{2}} \sqrt{\overline{C}_1 \overline{C}}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_1^{(p)}(n, q, \alpha) &= \overline{\nu}, \quad \nu_2^{(p)}(n, q, \alpha, \theta_1) = \frac{3\overline{\nu}}{2\overline{\beta}(n, q, \alpha, \theta_1)} \quad \text{and, for } j = 3, \dots, p-3, \\ \nu_j^{(p)}(n, q, \alpha, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_{j-1}) &= \\ &\max \left\{ \frac{3}{2\overline{\beta}(n, q, \alpha, \theta_1)} \nu_{j-1}^{(p')} (n, q, \alpha, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_{j-1}) : p' = j+2, \dots, p-1 \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

we see that if alternative (B) holds, the conclusions (a)-(f) of the lemma follow with $V_k, \mathbf{C}_k, \mathbf{C}'_k, \Gamma_k$ in place of $V, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{C}', \Gamma$; with constants $\kappa^{(p)}, C_0^{(p)}, C_2^{(p)}$ depending only on $n, q, \alpha, \theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_{p-4}$; with $\nu_1^{(p)}$ depending only on n, q, α and for each $j = 2, 3, \dots, p-3$, with $\nu_j^{(p)}$ depending only on n, q, α and $\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3, \dots, \theta_{j-1}$. Note that in checking that conclusion (f) holds with $V_k, \mathbf{C}_k$ in place of $V, \mathbf{C}$, we have used the fact that $\text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\text{spt} \|\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_k\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1), \{0\} \times B_1) \geq \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\text{spt} \|\mathbf{C}_k\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1), \{0\} \times B_1) - \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\text{spt} \|\mathbf{C}_k\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1), \text{spt} \|\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_k\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1)) \geq \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\text{spt} \|\mathbf{C}_k\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1), \{0\} \times B_1) - \sqrt{\overline{C}}(\tilde{Q}_k + Q_k)$. Similar reasoning applies in checking conclusion (b). This completes the proof. $\square$

Remark: Note that for $p \geq 5$, with the notation as in Lemmas 13.1 and 13.2 above, the following explicit formulae follow:

$$\kappa^{(p)}(n, q, \alpha, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_{p-4}) = \frac{3\overline{\kappa}}{2\Pi_{i=1}^{p-4}\overline{\beta}(n, q, \alpha, \theta_i)};$$

$$C_0^{(p)}(n, q, \alpha, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_{p-4}) = 2\overline{C} + 3\overline{C} \sum_{\ell=1}^{p-4} \frac{3^\ell}{\Pi_{i=1}^\ell \overline{\beta}(n, q, \alpha, \theta_i)} + \frac{3^{p-4}(\overline{C}_0 - 2\overline{C})}{\Pi_{i=1}^{p-4} \overline{\beta}(n, q, \alpha, \theta_i)};$$

$$C_2^{(p)}(n, q, \alpha, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_{p-4}) = a + 2a \sum_{\ell=1}^{p-4} \left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^{\ell/2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Pi_{i=1}^\ell \overline{\beta}(n, q, \alpha, \theta_i)}} + \left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^{(p-4)/2} \frac{\overline{C}_2 - a}{\sqrt{\Pi_{i=1}^{p-4} \overline{\beta}(n, q, \alpha, \theta_i)}}$$

where $a = 2^{-\frac{n+4}{2}} \sqrt{\overline{C}_1 \overline{C}}$;

$$\nu_1^{(p)}(n, q, \alpha) = \overline{\nu}; \quad \nu_j^{(p)}(n, q, \alpha, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_{j-1}) = \left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^{j-1} \frac{\overline{\nu}}{\Pi_{i=1}^{j-1} \overline{\beta}(n, q, \alpha, \theta_i)}, \quad 2 \leq j \leq p-3.$$

Lemma 13.3. *Let $q \geq 2$ be an integer and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. For $j = 1, 2, \dots, 2q-3$, let $\theta_j \in (0, 1/4)$ be such that $\theta_1 > 8\theta_2 > 64\theta_3 > \dots > 8^{2q-4}\theta_{2q-3}$. There exist numbers $\epsilon = \epsilon(n, q, \alpha, \theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_{2q-3}) \in (0, 1/2)$, $\gamma = \gamma(n, q, \alpha, \theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_{2q-3}) \in (0, 1/2)$ such that the following is true: If $V \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$, $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C}_q$ satisfy Hypotheses 10.1, Hypothesis $(\star)$ (of Section 10) with $M = \frac{3}{2}M_0$ and if the induction hypotheses (H1), (H2) hold, then there exist an orthogonal rotation Γ of $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ and a cone $\mathbf{C}' \in \mathcal{C}_q$*

such that, with $\hat{E}_V$ and $Q_V(\mathbf{C})$ as defined in Lemma 13.2, we have the following:

- (a) $|e_1 - \Gamma(e_1)| \leq \kappa Q_V(\mathbf{C})$ and $|e_j - \Gamma(e_j)| \leq \kappa \hat{E}^{-1} Q_V(\mathbf{C})$ for each $j = 2, 3, \dots, n+1$;
- (b) $\text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}^2(\text{spt} \|\mathbf{C}'\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1), \text{spt} \|\mathbf{C}\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1)) \leq C_0 Q_V^2(\mathbf{C})$;

and for some $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, 2q-3\}$,

$$(c) \quad \theta_j^{-n-2} \int_{\Gamma(\mathbf{R} \times (B_{\theta_j/2} \setminus \{|x^2| \leq \theta_j/16\}))} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt} \|V\|) d\|\Gamma_{\#} \mathbf{C}'\|(X) \\ + \theta_j^{-n-2} \int_{\Gamma(\mathbf{R} \times B_{\theta_j})} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt} \|\Gamma_{\#} \mathbf{C}'\|) d\|V\|(X) \leq \nu_j \theta_j^2 Q_V^2(\mathbf{C});$$

$$(d) \quad \left(\theta_j^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_{\theta_j}} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|\Gamma_{\#}^{-1} V\|(X) \right)^{1/2} \\ \geq 2^{-\frac{n+4}{2}} \sqrt{C_1} \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\text{spt} \|\mathbf{C}\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1), P \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1)) - C_2 Q_V(\mathbf{C})$$

for any $P \in G_n$ of the form $P = \{x^1 = \lambda x^2\}$ for some $\lambda \in (-1, 1)$;

- (e) $\{Z : \Theta(\|\Gamma_{\#}^{-1} V\|, Z) \geq q\} \cap (\mathbf{R} \times (B_{\theta_j/2} \cap \{|x^2| < \theta_j/16\})) = \emptyset$;
- (f) $(\omega_n \theta_j^n)^{-1} \|\Gamma_{\#}^{-1} V\|(\mathbf{R} \times B_{\theta_j}) < q + 1/2$.

Here the constants $\kappa, C_0, C_2 \in (0, \infty)$ depend only on n, α in case $q = 2$ and only on n, q, α and $\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_{2q-4}$ in case $q \geq 3$; $\nu_1 = \nu_1(n, q, \alpha)$; and, in case $q \geq 3$, for each $j = 2, 3, \dots, 2q-3$, $\nu_j = \nu_j(n, q, \alpha, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_{j-1})$. (In particular, ν_j is independent of $\theta_j, \theta_{j+1}, \dots, \theta_{2q-3}$ for each $j = 1, 2, \dots, 2q-3$.)

Proof. Set $\epsilon = \min \{\epsilon^{(4)}, \epsilon^{(5)}, \dots, \epsilon^{(2q)}\}$ and $\gamma = \min \{\gamma^{(4)}, \gamma^{(5)}, \dots, \gamma^{(2q)}\}$, where

$$\epsilon^{(p)} = \epsilon^{(p)}(n, q, \alpha, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_{p-3}), \quad \gamma^{(p)} = \gamma^{(p)}(n, q, \alpha, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_{p-3}), \quad 4 \leq p \leq 2q,$$

are as in Lemma 13.2. Set $\nu_1 = \bar{\nu}$ and for each $j = 2, \dots, 2q-3$,

$$\nu_j = \max \left\{ \nu_j^{(j+3)}, \nu_j^{(j+4)}, \dots, \nu_j^{(2q)} \right\} \quad \left(= \nu_j^{(2q)} \right)$$

where $\bar{\nu}$ is as in Lemma 13.1, and for each $p \in \{5, \dots, 2q\}$, the numbers $\nu_j^{(p)}$ are as in Lemma 13.2 taken with scales $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{p-3}$. Note that then, $\nu_1 = \nu_1(n, q, \alpha)$ and in case $q \geq 3$,

$$\nu_j = \nu_j(n, q, \alpha, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_{j-1}) \quad \text{for } 2 \leq j \leq 2q-3.$$

$$\text{Set } \kappa = \max \left\{ \kappa^{(4)}, \kappa^{(5)}, \dots, \kappa^{(2q)} \right\} \quad \left(= \kappa^{(2q)} \right), \quad C_0 = \max \left\{ C_0^{(4)}, C_0^{(5)}, \dots, C_0^{(2q)} \right\} \quad \left(= C_0^{(2q)} \right),$$

$$C_2 = \max \left\{ C_2^{(4)}, C_2^{(5)}, \dots, C_2^{(2q)} \right\} \quad \left(= C_2^{(2q)} \right),$$

where for each $p \in \{4, 5, \dots, 2q\}$, the numbers $\kappa^{(p)}, C_0^{(p)}, C_2^{(p)}$ are as in Lemma 13.2 taken with scales $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{p-3}$.

Since $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C}_q$ implies that $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C}_q(p)$ for some $p \in \{4, 5, \dots, 2q\}$, the conclusions of the present lemma follow directly from Lemma 13.2. $\square$

14. PROPERTIES OF COARSE BLOW-UPS: PART III

Subject to the induction hypotheses (H1), (H2), we complete in this section the proof that $\mathcal{B}_q$ is a proper blow-up class, by showing that $\mathcal{B}_q$ satisfies property (B7). Recall that in order to do this, it only remains to rule out the possibility that $\mathcal{B}_q$ contains an element whose graph is the union of q half-hyperplanes in the half-space $\{x^2 \leq 0\}$ and q half-hyperplanes in $\{x^2 \geq 0\}$, with all half-hyperplanes meeting along $\{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1}$, and with at least two of the half-hyperplanes on each side distinct. (This is **Case 2** stated at the beginning of Section 9.)

Lemma 14.1. *Let $q \geq 2$ be an integer and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. There exist constants $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_1(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, 1)$ and $\gamma_1 = \gamma_1(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, 1)$ such that if the induction hypotheses (H1), (H2) hold, $V \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$,*

$$\Theta(\|V\|, 0) \geq q, \quad (\omega_n 2^n)^{-1} \|V\|(B_2^{n+1}(0)) < q + 1/2, \quad \omega_n^{-1} \|V\|(\mathbf{R} \times B_1) < q + 1/2,$$

$$\{Z : \Theta(\|V\|, Z) \geq q\} \cap (\mathbf{R} \times (B_{1/2} \setminus \{|x^2| < 1/16\})) = \emptyset,$$

$$\hat{E}_V^2 \equiv \int_{B \times \mathbf{R}} |x^1|^2 d\|V\|(X) < \epsilon_1 \quad \text{and}$$

$$\hat{E}_V^2 < \frac{3}{2} \inf_{\{P=\{x^1=\lambda x^2\}\}} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|V\|(X) \quad \text{then}$$

$$\int_{\mathbf{R} \times (B_{1/2} \setminus \{|x^2| < 1/16\})} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|V\|) d\|\mathbf{C}\|(X) + \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}\|) d\|V\|(X) \geq \gamma_1 \hat{E}_V^2$$

for any cone $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C}_q$.

Proof. For $j = 1, 2, \dots, 2q - 3$, choose numbers $\theta_j = \theta_j(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, 1/2)$ as follows: First choose $\theta_1 = \theta_1(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, 1/2)$ such that $\nu_1 \theta_1^{2(1-\alpha)} < 1$, where $\nu_1 = \nu_1(n, q, \alpha)$ is as in Lemma 13.3. Having chosen $\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_j$, $1 \leq j \leq 2q - 5$, choose $\theta_{j+1} = \theta_{j+1}(n, q, \alpha)$ such that $\theta_{j+1} < 8^{-1} \theta_j$ and $\nu_{j+1} \theta_{j+1}^{2(1-\alpha)} < 1$, where $\nu_{j+1} = \nu_{j+1}(n, q, \alpha, \theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_j)$ is as in Lemma 13.3. Note that these choices determine ν_{2q-3} , where $\nu_{2q-3} = \nu_{2q-3}(n, q, \alpha, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_{2q-4})$ is as in Lemma 13.3. Finally choose $\theta_{2q-3} = \theta_{2q-3}(n, q, \alpha)$ such that $\theta_{2q-3} \leq 8^{-1} \theta_{2q-4}$ and $\nu_{2q-3} \theta_{2q-3}^{2(1-\alpha)} < 1$.

Let $\epsilon_1 \in (0, \epsilon)$, $\gamma_1 \in (0, \gamma)$ be constants to be eventually chosen depending only on n, q and α , where $\epsilon = \epsilon(n, q, \alpha, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_{2q-3})$, $\gamma = \gamma(n, q, \alpha, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_{2q-3})$ are as in Lemma 13.3.

Suppose that the hypotheses of the present lemma are satisfied with $V \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$ and $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C}_q$, and suppose also that

$$(14.1) \quad \int_{\mathbf{R} \times (B_{1/2} \setminus \{|x^2| < 1/16\})} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|V\|) d\|\mathbf{C}\|(X) + \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}\|) d\|V\|(X) \leq \gamma_1 \hat{E}_V^2.$$

In particular, $V, \mathbf{C}$ then satisfy the hypotheses of Lemma 13.3. In what follows, for $\mathbf{C}' \in \mathcal{C}_q$, Γ an orthogonal rotation of $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ and $\rho \in (0, 1]$, we shall use the notation

$$Q_V(\mathbf{C}', \Gamma, \rho) = \left(\rho^{-n-2} \int_{\Gamma(\mathbf{R} \times (B_{\rho/2} \setminus \{|x^2| < \rho/16\}))} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|V\|) d\|\Gamma_\# \mathbf{C}'\|(X) + \rho^{-n-2} \int_{\Gamma(\mathbf{R} \times B_\rho)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\Gamma_\# \mathbf{C}'\|) d\|V\|(X) \right)^{1/2}.$$

We claim that we may apply Lemma 13.3 iteratively to obtain, for each $k = 0, 1, 2, 3, \dots$, an orthogonal rotation Γ_k of $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$, with $\Gamma_0 = \text{Identity}$, and a cone $\mathbf{C}_k \in \mathcal{C}_q$ with $\mathbf{C}_0 = \mathbf{C}$, satisfying, for $k \geq 1$,

$$(14.2) \quad |\Gamma_k(e_1) - \Gamma_{k-1}(e_1)|^2 \leq C\delta_k Q_V^2;$$

$$(14.3) \quad |\Gamma_k(e_j) - \Gamma_{k-1}(e_j)|^2 \leq C\delta_k \hat{E}_V^{-2} Q_V^2;$$

$$(14.4) \quad \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}^2(\text{spt} \|\mathbf{C}_k\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1), \text{spt} \|\mathbf{C}_{k-1}\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1)) \leq C\delta_k Q_V^2;$$

$$(14.5) \quad Q_V^2(\mathbf{C}_k, \Gamma_k, \sigma_k) \leq \nu_{j_k} \theta_{j_k}^2 Q_V^2(\mathbf{C}_{k-1}, \Gamma_{k-1}, \sigma_{k-1}) \leq \dots \leq \delta_k Q_V^2$$

for some $j_k \in \{1, 2, \dots, 2q-3\}$;

$$(14.6) \quad \left(\sigma_k^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_{\sigma_k}} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|\Gamma_k \# V\|(X) \right)^{1/2} \geq 2^{-\frac{n+4}{2}} \sqrt{C_1} \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\text{spt} \|\mathbf{C}_{k-1}\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1), P \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1)) - C_2 Q_V(\mathbf{C}_{k-1}, \Gamma_{k-1}, \sigma_{k-1})$$

for each $P \in G_n$ of the form $P = \{x^1 = \lambda x^2\}$ for some $\lambda \in (-1, 1)$;

$$(14.7) \quad \{Z : \Theta(\|\Gamma_k \# V\|, Z) \geq q\} \cap (\mathbf{R} \times (B_{\sigma_k} \setminus \{|x^2| < \sigma_k/16\})) = \emptyset; \text{ and}$$

$$(14.8) \quad (\omega_n \sigma_k^n)^{-1} \|\Gamma_k^{-1} V\|(\mathbf{R} \times B_{\sigma_k}) < q + 1/2$$

where $Q_V = Q_V(\mathbf{C}, \Gamma_0, 1)$, $C = C(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty)$, $C_2 = C_2(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty)$ and, for each $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$,

$$\sigma_k = \theta_{j_k} \sigma_{k-1}, \quad \delta_k = \nu_{j_k} \theta_{j_k}^2 \delta_{k-1}$$

for some $j_k \in \{1, 2, \dots, 2q-3\}$ where $\sigma_0 = \delta_0 = 1$. Thus

$$\sigma_k = \prod_{j=1}^{2q-3} \theta_j^{k_j} \quad \text{and} \quad \delta_k = \prod_{j=1}^{2q-3} (\nu_j \theta_j^2)^{k_j}$$

for some non-negative integers $k_1, k_2, \dots, k_{2q-3}$ such that $\sum_{j=1}^{2q-3} k_j = k$. Note in particular that

$$\theta_{2q-3}^k \leq \sigma_k \leq \theta_1^k, \quad \delta_k < \sigma_k^{2\alpha} < 4^{-k\alpha} \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{j=k}^{\infty} \delta_j < c\delta_k$$

for $k = 1, 2, \dots$, where $c = c(\alpha) \in (0, \infty)$.

To verify these assertions inductively, note that (14.4)-(14.7) with $k = 1$ follow directly from Lemma 13.3. Suppose $k \geq 2$ and that (14.4)-(14.7) hold with $1, 2, 3, \dots, k-1$ in place of k . We wish to apply Lemma 13.3 with $\eta_{\sigma_{k-1} \# \Gamma_{k-1}^{-1} \# V}$ in place of V and $\mathbf{C}_{k-1}$ in place of $\mathbf{C}$. Note first that by the triangle inequality and (14.8) with $k-1$ in place of k ,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{E}_{\eta_{\sigma_{k-1} \# \Gamma_{k-1}^{-1} \# V}}^2 &= \sigma_{k-1}^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_{\sigma_{k-1}}} |x^1|^2 d\|\Gamma_{k-1}^{-1} \# V\|(X) \\ &\leq 2 \sigma_{k-1}^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_{\sigma_{k-1}}} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt} \|\mathbf{C}_{k-1}\|) d\|\Gamma_{k-1}^{-1} \# V\|(X) \\ &\quad + \omega_n(2q+1) \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}^2(\text{spt} \|\mathbf{C}_{k-1}\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1), \{0\} \times B_1) \end{aligned}$$

and by applying (14.4) with $1, 2, \dots, k-1$ in place of k , summing over k , and using the fact that $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \delta_k^{1/2} < 2^{-\alpha}(1-2^{-\alpha})^{-1}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\text{spt} \|\mathbf{C}_{k-1}\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1), \{0\} \times B_1) &\leq \\ \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\text{spt} \|\mathbf{C}\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1), \{0\} \times B_1) + CQ_V, \quad C = C(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty); \quad \text{thus,} \end{aligned}$$

$$\hat{E}_{\eta_{\sigma_{k-1} \# \Gamma_{k-1}^{-1} \#} V}^2 \leq 2\omega_n(2q+1) \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}^2(\text{spt} \|\mathbf{C}\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1), \{0\} \times B_1) + CQ_V^2, \quad C = C(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty),$$

so that, by (10.1),

$$(14.9) \quad \hat{E}_{\eta_{\sigma_{k-1} \# \Gamma_{k-1}^{-1} \#} V}^2 \leq 2(2q+1)\omega_n c_1^2 \hat{E}_V^2 + CQ_V^2, \quad C = C(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty),$$

where $c_1 = c_1(n) \in (0, \infty)$ is as in (10.1); in particular,

$$(14.10) \quad \hat{E}_{\eta_{\sigma_{k-1} \# \Gamma_{k-1}^{-1} \#} V}^2 \leq C \hat{E}_V^2, \quad C = C(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty).$$

Again by (14.4),

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\text{spt} \|\mathbf{C}_{k-2}\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1), \{0\} \times B_1) &\geq \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\text{spt} \|\mathbf{C}\| \cap \mathbf{R} \times B_1, \{0\} \times B_1) \\ &\quad - \sum_{j=1}^{k-2} \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\text{spt} \|\mathbf{C}_{j-1}\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1), \text{spt} \|\mathbf{C}_j\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1)) \\ &\geq \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\text{spt} \|\mathbf{C}\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1), \{0\} \times B_1) - CQ_V \sum_{j=1}^{k-2} \delta_j^{1/2} \end{aligned}$$

which implies by (14.6) and (14.5) that

$$\hat{E}_{\eta_{\sigma_{k-1} \# \Gamma_{k-1}^{-1} \#} V} \geq 2^{-\frac{n+4}{2}} \sqrt{C_1} \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\text{spt} \|\mathbf{C}\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1), \{0\} \times B_1) - CQ_V$$

where $C = C(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty)$; hence by (10.2) and (14.1), we see that

$$(14.11) \quad \hat{E}_{\eta_{\sigma_{k-1} \# \Gamma_{k-1}^{-1} \#} V} \geq (C_1 - C\gamma_1) \hat{E}_V$$

where $C_1 = C_1(n, q)$, $C = C(n, q) \in (0, \infty)$. Thus if $2C\gamma_1 < C_1$, it follows from (14.1), (14.5) and (14.11) that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbf{R} \times (B_{1/2} \setminus \{|x| < 1/16\})} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt} \|\eta_{\sigma_{k-1} \# \Gamma_{k-1}^{-1} \#} V\|) d\|\mathbf{C}_{k-1}\|(X) \\ (14.12) \quad &+ \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt} \|\mathbf{C}_{k-1}\|) d\|\eta_{\sigma_{k-1} \# \Gamma_{k-1}^{-1} \#} V\|(X) \leq C\gamma_1 \hat{E}_{\eta_{\sigma_{k-1} \# \Gamma_{k-1}^{-1} \#} V}^2 \end{aligned}$$

and from (14.10), that

$$\hat{E}_{\eta_{\sigma_{k-1} \# \Gamma_{k-1}^{-1} \#} V}^2 \leq C\epsilon_1$$

where $C = C(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty)$. By (14.6) again with $k-1$ in place of k and (14.4) with $1, 2, \dots, k-1$ in place of k ,

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(\sigma_{k-1}^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_{\sigma_{k-1}}} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|\Gamma_{k-1} \# V\|(X) \right)^{1/2} \geq \\ &2^{-\frac{n+4}{2}} \sqrt{C_1} \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\text{spt} \|\mathbf{C}\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1), P \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1)) - CQ_V \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|\eta_{\sigma_{k-1} \# \Gamma_{k-1} \# V}\|(X) \geq \\
& \quad 2^{-n-5} \overline{C}_1 \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}^2(\text{spt} \|\mathbf{C}\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1), P \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1)) - CQ_V^2 \\
& \geq 2^{-n-5} \overline{C}_1 \omega_n^{-1} (2q+1)^{-1} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|V\|(X) - CQ_V^2 \\
& \geq 2^{-n-5} \overline{C}_1 \omega_n^{-1} (2q+1)^{-1} \left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^{-1} \hat{E}_V^2 - CQ_V^2 \\
& \geq 2^{-n-6} \overline{C}_1 \omega_n^{-2} (2q+1)^{-2} c_1^{-2} \left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^{-1} \hat{E}_{\eta_{\sigma_{k-1} \# \Gamma_{k-1} \# V}}^2 - CQ_V^2 \\
& \geq \left(2^{-n-6} \overline{C}_1 \omega_n^{-2} (2q+1)^{-2} c_1^{-2} \left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^{-1} - C\gamma_1\right) \hat{E}_{\eta_{\sigma_{k-1} \# \Gamma_{k-1} \# V}}^2
\end{aligned}$$

where $C = C(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty)$ and we have used our hypothesis that

$$\hat{E}_V^2 < \frac{3}{2} \inf_{P=\{x^1=\lambda x^2\}} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|V\|(X).$$

This readily implies that if we choose $\gamma_1 = \gamma_1(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, 1)$ sufficiently small, then

$$\hat{E}_{\eta_{\sigma_{k-1} \# \Gamma_{k-1} \# V}}^2 \leq \frac{3}{2} M_0 \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|\eta_{\sigma_{k-1} \# \Gamma_{k-1} \# V}\|(X)$$

for any hyperplane P of the form $P = \{x^1 = \lambda x^2\}$.

So if we choose $\gamma_1 = \gamma_1(n, q, \alpha)$ and $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_1(n, q, \alpha)$ sufficiently small, we can apply Lemma 13.3 with $\eta_{\sigma_{k-1} \# \Gamma_{k-1} \# V}$ in place of V and $\mathbf{C}_{k-1}$ in place of $\mathbf{C}$ to obtain an orthogonal rotation Γ of $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ and a cone $\mathbf{C}_k \in \mathcal{C}_q$ such that, with $\Gamma_k = \Gamma_{k-1} \circ \Gamma$, (14.2)-(14.8) hold. This completes the inductive proof that (14.2)-(14.8) hold for all $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$. Writing

$$\mathbf{C}_k = \sum_{j=1}^q |H_j^k| + |G_j^k|$$

where for each $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, q\}$, H_j^k is the half-space defined by $H_j^k = \{(x^1, x^2, y) \in \mathbf{R}^{n+1} : x^2 < 0 \text{ and } x^1 = \lambda_j^k x^2\}$, G_j^k the half-space defined by $G_j^k = \{(x^1, x^2, y) \in \mathbf{R}^{n+1} : x^2 > 0 \text{ and } x^1 = \mu_j^k x^2\}$, with λ_j^k, μ_j^k constants, $\lambda_1^k \geq \lambda_2^k \geq \dots \geq \lambda_q^k$ and $\mu_1^k \leq \mu_2^k \leq \dots \leq \mu_q^k$, note that by (10.2) (applied with $\eta_{\sigma_k \# \Gamma_k \# V}$ in place of V and $\mathbf{C}_k$ in place of $\mathbf{C}$), (14.11) and (14.12), we also have that

$$(14.13) \quad |\lambda_1^k - \lambda_q^k| \geq C \hat{E}_V \quad \text{and} \quad |\mu_1^k - \mu_q^k| \geq C \hat{E}_V, \quad C = C(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty),$$

for all $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$.

By (14.4) $\{\text{spt} \|\mathbf{C}_k\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1)\}$ is a Cauchy sequence (in Hausdorff distance) and hence, since $\Theta(\|\mathbf{C}_k\|, 0) = q$ for each $k = 1, 2, \dots$, there is a varifold $\mathbf{H} \in \mathcal{C}_q$ such that passing to a subsequence $\{k'\}$ of $\{k\}$, $\mathbf{C}_{k'} \llcorner B_2^{n+1}(0) \rightarrow \mathbf{H} \llcorner B_2^{n+1}(0)$ and

$$(14.14) \quad \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}^2(\text{spt} \|\mathbf{H}\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1), \text{spt} \|\mathbf{C}_{k'}\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1)) \leq C \delta_{k'} Q_V^2$$

for each k' , where $C = C(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty)$. By (14.13), $\text{spt} \|\mathbf{H}\|$ is not a hyperplane. Since $\delta_k \leq \sigma_k^{2\alpha}$, it follows from (14.5), (14.8) and (14.14) that

$$(14.15) \quad \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt} \|\mathbf{H}\|) d\|\eta_{\sigma_{k'} \# \Gamma_{k'} \# V}\|(X) \leq C \sigma_{k'}^{2\alpha} Q_V^2 \quad \text{and}$$

$$(14.16) \quad \int_{\mathbf{R} \times (B_{1/2} \setminus \{|x^2| < 1/16\})} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt} \|\eta_{\sigma_{k'}} \# \Gamma_{k'}^{-1} V\|) d\|\mathbf{C}_{k'}\|(X) \leq C \sigma_{k'}^{2\alpha} Q_V^2$$

for all k' , where $C = C(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, \infty)$.

Now, since $q \leq \Theta(\|V\|, 0) \leq (\omega_n 2^n)^{-1} \|V\|(B_2^{n+1}(0)) < q + 1/2$, it follows from the monotonicity formula that

$$q \leq \Theta(\|\eta_{\sigma_{k'}} \# \Gamma_{k'}^{-1} V\|, 0) \leq (\omega_n 2^n)^{-1} \|\eta_{\sigma_{k'}} \# \Gamma_{k'}^{-1} V\|(B_2^{n+1}(0)) \leq (\omega_n 2^n)^{-1} \|V\|(B_2^{n+1}(0)) < q + 1/2.$$

Hence, there is a stationary integral varifold W on $B_2^{n+1}(0)$ with

$$q \leq \Theta(\|W\|, 0) \leq (\omega_n 2^n)^{-1} \|W\|(B_2^{n+1}(0)) < q + 1/2$$

such that, passing to a further subsequence without changing notation,

$$(14.17) \quad \eta_{\sigma_{k'}} \# \Gamma_{k'}^{-1} V \rightarrow W$$

as varifolds on $B_2^{n+1}(0)$. The estimate (14.15) implies that $\text{spt} \|W\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1) \subseteq \text{spt} \|\mathbf{H}\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1)$, and since $\text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\text{spt} \|\eta_{\sigma_{k'}} \# \Gamma_{k'}^{-1} V\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1), \text{spt} \|W\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1)) \rightarrow 0$, it follows from (14.16), the triangle inequality and the weak convergence $\|\mathbf{C}_{k'}\| \rightarrow \|\mathbf{H}\|$ on $\mathbf{R} \times B_{1/2}$ that $\text{spt} \|\mathbf{H}\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times (B_{1/2} \setminus \{|x^2| < 1/16\})) \subseteq \text{spt} \|W\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times (B_{1/2} \setminus \{|x^2| < 1/16\}))$. Hence $\text{spt} \|W\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1) = \text{spt} \|\mathbf{H}\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1)$, from which it also follows that $\Theta(\|W\|, 0) = q$.

Thus (14.17) contradicts case $\Theta(\|\mathbf{C}_0\|, 0) = q$ of the induction hypothesis (H2), proving the Lemma. $\square$

Corollary 14.2. *Let q be an integer ≥ 2 , and suppose that the induction hypotheses (H1), (H2) hold. Then the class $\mathcal{B}_q$ (defined in Section 5) satisfies property (B7) of the definition of proper blow-up classes (given in Section 4).*

Proof. If not, in view of Lemma 9.1, there exists an element $v_\star \in \mathcal{B}_q$ such that, for $j = 1, 2, \dots, q$, $v_\star^j(x^2, y) = L_1^j(x^2, y)$ if $x^2 < 0$ and $v_\star^j(x^2, y) = L_2^j(x^2, y)$ if $x^2 \geq 0$ where $L_1^j, L_2^j : \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ are linear functions with $L_1^j(0, y) = L_2^j(0, y) = 0$ and

$$(14.18) \quad L_1^{j_1} \neq L_1^{j_1+1} \quad \text{and} \quad L_2^{j_2} \neq L_2^{j_2+1} \quad \text{for some } j_1, j_2 \in \{1, 2, \dots, q-1\}.$$

Since the average $(v_\star)_a = q^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^q v_\star^j$ is linear (by property (B3)) and $\|v_\star - (v_\star)_a\|_{L^2(B_1)}^{-1} (v_\star - (v_\star)_a) \in \mathcal{B}_q$ (by property (B5I)), where $v_\star - (v_\star)_a = (v_\star^1 - (v_\star)_a, \dots, v_\star^q - (v_\star)_a)$, we may assume without loss of generality that $(v_\star)_a = 0$ and that

$$(14.19) \quad \|v_\star\|_{L^2(B_1)} = 1.$$

By the definition of $\mathcal{B}_q$, for each $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$, there exist a stationary integral varifold V_k of $B_2^{n+1}(0)$ with

$$(14.20) \quad (\omega_n 2^n)^{-1} \|V_k\|(B_2^{n+1}(0)) < q + 1/2, \quad q - 1/2 \leq \omega_n^{-1} \|V_k\|(\mathbf{R} \times B_1) < q + 1/2 \quad \text{and}$$

$$(14.21) \quad \hat{E}_k^2 \equiv \int_{B_1 \times \mathbf{R}} |x^1|^2 d\|V_k\|(X) \rightarrow 0$$

as $k \rightarrow \infty$, such that the following hold: If $\sigma \in (0, 1)$, k is sufficiently large depending on σ , $\Sigma_k \subset B_\sigma$ is the measurable set corresponding to Σ and $v_k^j : B_\sigma \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, q$, are the Lipschitz functions corresponding to u^j in Theorem 5.1 applied with V_k in place of V , then by Theorem 5.1, $v_k^1 \leq v_k^2 \leq \dots \leq v_k^q$,

$$(14.22) \quad \text{Lip } v_k^j \leq 1/2 \quad \text{for each } j \in \{1, 2, \dots, q\},$$

$$(14.23) \quad \|V_k\|(\Sigma_k \times \mathbf{R}) + \mathcal{H}^n(\Sigma_k) \leq C_\sigma \hat{E}_k^2$$

where $C_\sigma \in (0, \infty)$ is a constant depending only on n , q and σ ,

$$(14.24) \quad \text{spt } \|V_k\| \cap ((B_\sigma \setminus \Sigma_k) \times \mathbf{R}) = \cup_{j=1}^q \text{graph } v_k^j \cap ((B_\sigma \setminus \Sigma_k) \times \mathbf{R}), \text{ and}$$

$$(14.25) \quad \hat{E}_k^{-1} v_k^j \rightarrow v_\star^j$$

where the convergence is in $L^2(B_\sigma)$ and weakly in $W^{1,2}(B_\sigma)$. Note that by (14.20), after passing to a subsequence without changing notation, there exists a stationary integral varifold V of $B_2^{n+1}(0)$ such that $V_k \rightarrow V$, and by (14.21), $\text{spt } \|V \llcorner (\mathbf{R} \times B_1)\| \subset \{0\} \times \overline{B}_1$, so by (14.20) and the Constancy Theorem for stationary integral varifolds, $V \llcorner (\mathbf{R} \times B_1) = q|\{0\} \times B_1|$. Hence by replacing V_k with $\eta_{0,1/2} \# V_k$, and noting that by homogeneity of $v_\star$, the coarse blow-up of $\{\eta_{0,1/2} \# V_k\}$ is still $v_\star$, we may assume that for all sufficiently large k ,

$$(14.26) \quad q - 1/4 \leq (\omega_n 2^n)^{-1} \|V_k\|(B_2^{n+1}(0)) < q + 1/4.$$

By using the argument justifying the assertion (9.7), we may pass to a subsequence without changing notation and find points $Z_k \in \text{spt } \|V_k\| \cap B_1^{n+1}(0)$ with $\Theta(\|V_k\|, Z_k) \geq q$ and $Z_k \rightarrow 0$. Replacing V_k with $\eta_{Z_k, 1-|Z_k|} \# V_k$, we may thus assume that

$$(14.27) \quad \Theta(\|V_k\|, 0) \geq q$$

for each $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$, and in view of (14.26), the monotonicity formula implies that the new V_k satisfy (14.20). We now argue that for each sufficiently large k , we must have that

$$(14.28) \quad \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} |x^1|^2 d\|V_k\|(X) < \frac{3}{2} \inf_{\{P=\{x^1=\lambda x^2\}\}} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|V_k\|(X).$$

If this were false, then there is a subsequence $\{k'\}$ of $\{k\}$ and corresponding to each k' , a number $\lambda_{k'} \in \mathbf{R}$ such that, with $P_{k'} = \{x^1 = \lambda_{k'} x^2\}$, we have

$$\int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, P_{k'}) d\|V_{k'}\|(X) \leq \frac{5}{6} \hat{E}_{k'}^2$$

for all k' . In particular, for each $\sigma \in (1/2, 1)$ and sufficiently large k' ,

$$(14.29) \quad (1 + \lambda_{k'}^2)^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_\sigma \setminus \Sigma_{k'}} (v_{k'}^j(x^2, y) - \lambda_{k'} x^2)^2 dx^2 dy \leq \frac{5}{6} \hat{E}_{k'}^2,$$

whence $(1 + \lambda_{k'}^2)^{-1} \lambda_{k'}^2 \int_{B_{1/2} \setminus \Sigma_{k'}} |x^2|^2 dx^2 dy \leq \frac{11}{3} \hat{E}_{k'}^2$; thus, $|\lambda_{k'}| \leq C \hat{E}_{k'}$ for all sufficiently large k' , where $C = C(n) \in (0, \infty)$, and hence, passing to a further subsequence without changing notation, $\hat{E}_{k'}^{-1} \lambda_{k'} \rightarrow \ell$ for some $\ell \in \mathbf{R}$. It follows from (14.29) and (14.23) that

$$\sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_\sigma} (v_{k'}^j - \lambda_{k'} x^2)^2 dx^2 dy \leq \frac{5}{6} (1 + \lambda_{k'}^2) \hat{E}_{k'}^2 + 2C_\sigma \sup_{B_\sigma} (|v_{k'}|^2 + \lambda_{k'}^2 |x^2|^2) \hat{E}_{k'}^2.$$

First dividing this by $\hat{E}_{k'}^2$ and letting $k' \rightarrow \infty$, and then letting $\sigma \rightarrow 1$, we see that $\sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_1} (v_\star^j - \ell x^2)^2 \leq 5/6$. Since $v_\star^j(x^2, y) = \ell_j x^2$ if $x^2 < 0$ and $v_\star^j(x^2, y) = m_j x^2$ if $x^2 > 0$ for some $\ell_j, m_j \in \mathbf{R}$, this implies that $\int_{B_1} |v_\star|^2 - 2\ell \sum_{j=1}^q (\ell_j + m_j) \int_{B_1 \cap \{x^2 > 0\}} |x^2|^2 + \ell^2 \int_{B_1} |x^2|^2 \leq 5/6$, which is a contradiction since $(v_\star)_a \equiv 0$ (so that $\sum_{j=1}^q \ell_j = \sum_{j=1}^q m_j = 0$) and $\int_{B_1} |v_\star|^2 = 1$. Thus (14.28) must hold for all sufficiently large k .

For $j = 1, 2, 3, \dots, q$ and $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$, let $h_j^k = \hat{E}_k L_1^j$, $g_j^k = \hat{E}_k L_2^j$, $H_j^k = \text{graph } h_j^k$, $G_j^k = \text{graph } g_j^k$ and $\mathbf{C}_k = \sum_{j=1}^q |H_j^k| + |G_j^k|$. By (14.22), (14.23) and (14.24),

$$(14.30) \quad \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_\sigma} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}_k\|) d\|V_k\|(X) \leq 2 \int_{B_\sigma} |v_k - \hat{E}_k v_\star|^2 + C_\sigma \sup_{X \in \text{spt } \|V_k\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_\sigma)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}_k\|) \hat{E}_k^2.$$

By (14.19) and homogeneity of $v_\star$, $\int_{B_\sigma} |v_\star|^2 = \sigma^{n+2}$, so by (14.25), for each $\theta \in (0, 1/8)$ and $\sigma \in (0, 1)$, $\int_{B_\sigma} |v_k|^2 \geq (1 - \theta)\sigma^{n+2} \hat{E}_k^2$ for sufficiently large k . Since

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_\sigma} |x^1|^2 d\|V_k\|(X) &= \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_\sigma} \sqrt{1 + |Dv_k^j|^2} |v_k^j|^2 - \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{\Sigma_k} \sqrt{1 + |Dv_k^j|^2} |v_k^j|^2 \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathbf{R} \times \Sigma_k} |x^1|^2 d\|V_k\|(X) \\ &\geq \int_{B_\sigma} |v_k|^2 - 2C_\sigma \left(\sup_{B_\sigma} |v_k|^2 \right) \hat{E}_k^2, \end{aligned}$$

it follows that

$$(14.31) \quad \begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbf{R} \times (B_1 \setminus B_\sigma)} |x^1|^2 d\|V_k\|(X) \\ &\leq \left(1 - (1 - \theta)\sigma^{n+2} + 2C_\sigma \left(\sup_{B_\sigma} |v_k|^2 \right) \right) \hat{E}_k^2 \end{aligned}$$

for all sufficiently large k . By the triangle inequality,

$$(14.32) \quad \begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbf{R} \times (B_1 \setminus B_\sigma)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}_k\|) d\|V_k\|(X) \\ &\leq 2 \int_{\mathbf{R} \times (B_1 \setminus B_\sigma)} |x^1|^2 d\|V_k\|(X) + 2\text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}^2(\text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}_k\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1), \{0\} \times B_1) \|V_k\|(\mathbf{R} \times (B_1 \setminus B_\sigma)) \\ &\leq 2 \int_{\mathbf{R} \times (B_1 \setminus B_\sigma)} |x^1|^2 d\|V_k\|(X) + C\mathcal{H}^n(B_1 \setminus B_\sigma) \hat{E}_k^2 \end{aligned}$$

for all sufficiently large k , where $C = C(n, q) \in (0, \infty)$. Here we have used the fact that $V_k \llcorner (\mathbf{R} \times B_1) \rightarrow q|\{0\} \times B_1|$. Thus, if $\gamma_1 = \gamma_1(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, 1/2)$ is the constant as in Lemma 14.1, then we may fix $\theta = \theta(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, 1/8)$ sufficiently small and $\sigma = \sigma(n, q, \alpha) \in (0, 1)$ sufficiently close to 1 in order to conclude from (14.25), (14.30), (14.31) and (14.31) that for all sufficiently large k ,

$$(14.33) \quad \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}_k\|) d\|V_k\|(X) \leq \frac{\gamma_1}{4} \hat{E}_k^2.$$

In view of (14.18), we have by the argument leading to (9.5) that for all sufficiently large k , $\Sigma_k \subset B_\sigma \cap \{|x^2| < 1/64\}$ and that

$$(14.34) \quad V_k \llcorner ((\mathbf{R} \times B_\sigma) \cap \{x^2 \leq -1/64\}) = \sum_{j=1}^q |\text{graph } u_k^j| \llcorner ((\mathbf{R} \times B_\sigma) \cap \{x^2 \leq -1/64\}) \quad \text{and}$$

$$(14.35) \quad V_k \llcorner ((\mathbf{R} \times B_\sigma) \cap \{x^2 \geq 1/64\}) = \sum_{j=1}^q |\text{graph } w_k^j| \llcorner ((\mathbf{R} \times B_\sigma) \cap \{x^2 \geq 1/64\})$$

where $u_k^1 \leq u_k^2 \leq \dots u_k^q$ and $w_k^1 \leq w_k^2 \leq \dots w_k^q$ (thus, $v_k|_{B_\sigma \cap \{x^2 \leq -1/64\}} \equiv u_k$ and $v_k|_{B_\sigma \cap \{x^2 \geq 1/64\}} \equiv w_k$), u_k^j, w_k^j are C^2 functions on $B_\sigma \cap \{x^2 \leq -1/64\}$, $B_\sigma \cap \{x^2 \geq 1/64\}$ respectively, solving the minimal surface equation there, and satisfying, by elliptic theory,

$$(14.36) \quad \sup_{B_{\kappa\sigma} \cap \{x^2 \leq -1/64\}} |D u_k^j|^2 + \sup_{B_{\kappa\sigma} \cap \{x^2 \geq 1/64\}} |D w_k^j|^2 \leq C(\kappa, \sigma) \hat{E}_k^2$$

for each $\kappa \in (0, 1)$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, q$ where $C(\kappa, \sigma) \in (0, \infty)$ is a constant depending only on n, κ and σ . We see from (14.34), (14.35), (14.36) and (14.25) that

$$(14.37) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbf{R} \times (B_{1/2} \setminus \{|x^2| < 1/64\})} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|V_k\|) d\|\mathbf{C}_k\|(X) \\ & \leq 2 \sum_{j=1}^q \left(\int_{B_{1/2} \cap \{x^2 < -1/64\}} |\hat{E}_k L_1^j - u_k^j|^2 + \int_{B_{1/2} \cap \{x^2 \geq 1/64\}} |\hat{E}_k L_2^j - w_k^j|^2 \right) \leq \eta_k \hat{E}_k^2 \end{aligned}$$

where $\eta_k \rightarrow 0$. By (14.33) and (14.37),

$$\int_{\mathbf{R} \times (B_{1/2} \setminus \{|x^2| < 1/64\})} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|V_k\|) d\|\mathbf{C}_k\|(X) + \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}_k\|) d\|V_k\|(X) \leq \frac{\gamma_1}{2} \hat{E}_k^2$$

for sufficiently large k , which in view of (14.20), (14.21) and (14.27) contradicts Lemma 14.1. $\square$

Theorem 14.3. *Let q be an integer ≥ 2 , $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and suppose that the induction hypotheses (H1), (H2) hold. Let $\mathcal{B}_q$ be the class of functions defined in Section 5. (Thus, each $v \in \mathcal{B}_q$ is a coarse blow-up, in the sense described in Section 5, of a sequences of varifolds in $\mathcal{S}_\alpha$ converging weakly, in $\mathbf{R} \times B_1$, to $q|\{0\} \times B_1|$). If $v = (v^1, v^2, \dots, v^q) \in \mathcal{B}_q$, then v^j is harmonic in B_1 for each $j = 1, 2, \dots, q$; furthermore, if $\{V_k\} \subset \mathcal{S}_\alpha$ is a sequence whose coarse blow-up is v , and if for each of infinitely many values of k , there is a point $Z_k \in \text{spt } \|V_k\| \cap (B_{3/4} \times \mathbf{R})$ with $\Theta(\|V_k\|, Z_k) \geq q$, then $v^1 = v^2 = \dots = v^q$.*

Proof. By the discussion of Section 8 and Corollary 14.2, $\mathcal{B}_q$ is a proper blow-up class for a constant $C = C(n, q) \in (0, \infty)$. The present theorem follows from Theorem 4.1 and the remark at the end of Section 8. $\square$

15. THE SHEETING THEOREM

This section is devoted to the proof of the Sheetting Theorem (Theorem 3.2') subject to the induction hypotheses (H1) and (H2).

Lemma 15.1. *Let q be an integer ≥ 2 , $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $\theta \in (0, 1/4)$. Suppose that the induction hypotheses (H1), (H2) hold. There exists a number $\beta_0 = \beta_0(n, q, \alpha, \theta) \in (0, 1/2)$ such that if $V \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$, $(\omega_n 2^n)^{-1} \|V\|(B_2^{n+1}(0)) < q + 1/2$, $q - 1/2 \leq (\omega_n)^{-1} \|V\|(B_1 \times \mathbf{R}) < q + 1/2$, and $\int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|V\|(X) < \beta_0$ for some affine hyperplane P of $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ with $\text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}^2(P \cap (B_1 \times \mathbf{R}), B_1 \times \{0\}) < \beta_0$, then the following hold:*

- (a) *Either $V \llcorner (B_{1/2} \times \mathbf{R}) = \sum_{j=1}^q |\text{graph } u_j|$ where $u_j \in C^2(B_{1/2}; \mathbf{R})$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, q$; $u_1 \leq u_2 \leq \dots \leq u_q$ on $B_{1/2}$; $u_{j_0} < u_{j_0+1}$ on $B_{1/2}$ for some $j_0 \in \{1, 2, \dots, q-1\}$ and, for each $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, q\}$,*

$$\sup_{B_{1/2}} |u_j - p|^2 + |D u_j - D p|^2 + |D^2 u_j|^2 \leq C \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|V\|(X)$$

where $C = C(n, q) \in (0, \infty)$ and $p : \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is the affine function such that $\text{graph } p = P$; or, there exists an affine hyperplane P' with

$$\text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}^2(P' \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1), P \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1)) \leq C_1 \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|V\|(X) \quad \text{and}$$

$$\theta^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_\theta} \text{dist}^2(X, P') d\|V\|(X) \leq C_2 \theta^2 \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, P) d\|V\|(X)$$

where $C_1 = C_1(n, q) \in (0, \infty)$ and $C_2 = C_2(n, q) \in (0, \infty)$.

$$(b) \ (\omega_n(2\theta)^n)^{-1} \|V\|(B_{2\theta}^{n+1}(0)) < q + 1/2 \text{ and } q - 1/2 \leq (\omega_n \theta^n)^{-1} \|V\|(\mathbf{R} \times B_\theta) < q + 1/2.$$

Proof. For each $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$, let $V_k \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$ be such that

$$(15.1) \quad (\omega_n 2^n)^{-1} \|V_k\|(B_2^{n+1}(0)) < q + 1/2 \text{ and } q - 1/2 \leq (\omega_n)^{-1} \|V_k\|(\mathbf{R} \times B_1) < q + 1/2,$$

and let P_k be an affine hyperplane of $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ such that

$$(15.2) \quad \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(P_k \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1), \{0\} \times B_1) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{and}$$

$$(15.3) \quad \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, P_k) d\|V_k\|(X) \rightarrow 0.$$

The lemma will be established by proving that for each of infinitely many k , the conclusions hold with V_k in place of V , P_k in place of P and with fixed constants $C = C(n, q)$, $C_1 = C_1(n, q)$, $C_2 = C_2(n, q) \in (0, \infty)$.

By (15.2), (15.3) and the triangle inequality, $\hat{E}_k \equiv \sqrt{\int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} |x^1|^2 d\|V_k\|(X)} \rightarrow 0$, and hence, by (15.1) and the Constancy Theorem, $V_k \llcorner (\mathbf{R} \times B_1) \rightarrow q|\{0\} \times B_1|$, so that

$$q - 1/2 \leq (\omega_n \theta^n)^{-1} \|V_k\|(\mathbf{R} \times B_\theta) < q + 1/2$$

for sufficiently large k . Furthermore, by the monotonicity formula (6.1),

$$(\omega_n(2\theta)^n)^{-1} \|V_k\|(B_{2\theta}^{n+1}(0)) \leq (\omega_n 2^n)^{-1} \|V_k\|(B_2^{n+1}(0)) < q + 1/2.$$

Thus, conclusion (b) with V_k in place of V holds for sufficiently large k .

For each $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$, there exists, by (15.2), a rigid motion Γ_k of $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ with $\Gamma_k \rightarrow \text{Identity}$ such that $\Gamma_k(P_k) = \{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^n$. Let $\tilde{V}_k = \eta_{9/10} \# \Gamma_k \# V_k$. Then by (15.1), $(\omega_n 2^n)^{-1} \|\tilde{V}_k\|(B_2^{n+1}(0)) < q + 1/2$, and by (15.3),

$$(15.4) \quad \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_{19/18}} |x^1|^2 d\|\tilde{V}_k\|(X) \leq \left(\frac{9}{10}\right)^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, P_k) d\|V_k\|(X) \rightarrow 0.$$

It follows again by the Constancy Theorem, for all sufficiently large k ,

$$q - 1/2 \leq (\omega_n)^{-1} \|\tilde{V}_k\|(\mathbf{R} \times B_1) < q + 1/2.$$

Let $\tilde{v} = (\tilde{v}^1, \tilde{v}^2, \dots, \tilde{v}^q) \in \mathcal{B}_q$ be the coarse blow-up of (a subsequence) of $\tilde{V}_k$ by the coarse excess $\hat{E}_{\tilde{V}_k} \equiv \sqrt{\int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} |x^1|^2 d\|\tilde{V}_k\|(X)}$. Suppose first that the $\tilde{v}^j$'s are not all identical to one another. Then by Theorem 14.3, for all sufficiently large k ,

$$Z \in \text{spt } \|\tilde{V}_k\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_{3/4}) \implies \Theta(\|\tilde{V}_k\|, Z) < q;$$

hence, by Remark 3 of Section 7, we may apply Theorem 3.4 followed by elliptic theory to $\tilde{V}_k$ and conclude, after transforming by $\Gamma_k^{-1} \circ \eta_{9/10}^{-1}$, that

$$V_k \llcorner (\mathbf{R} \times B_{1/2}) = \sum_{j=1}^q |\text{graph } u_k^j|$$

for all sufficiently large k , where $u_k^j \in C^2(B_{1/2}; \mathbf{R})$, $u_k^1 \leq u_k^2 \leq \dots \leq u_k^q$; $u_k^{j_0} < u_k^{j_0+1}$ on $B_{1/2}$ for some $j_0 \in \{1, 2, \dots, q-1\}$ and, for each $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, q\}$,

$$\sup_{B_{1/2}} |u_k^j - p_k|^2 + |Du_k^j - Dp_k|^2 + |D^2 u_k^j|^2 \leq C \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, P_k) d\|V_k\|(X)$$

where $C = C(n, q) \in (0, \infty)$ and $p_k : \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is the affine function such that $\text{graph } p_k = P_k$.

If on the other hand $\tilde{v}^1 = \tilde{v}^2 = \dots = \tilde{v}^q (= \tilde{v}$, say) on B_1 , then letting $\tilde{p}(x) = \tilde{v}(0) + D\tilde{v}(0) \cdot x$ and $\tilde{P}_k = \text{graph } \hat{E}_{\tilde{V}_k} \tilde{p}$, it follows from Theorem 5.1 and the standard estimates for harmonic functions that

$$(15.5) \quad \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\tilde{P}_k \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1), \{0\} \times B_1) \leq C \hat{E}_{\tilde{V}_k} \quad \text{and}$$

$$(15.6) \quad \theta^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_{2\theta}} \text{dist}^2(X, \tilde{P}_k) d\|\tilde{V}_k\|(X) \leq C \theta^2 \hat{E}_{\tilde{V}_k}^2$$

for all sufficiently large k , where $C = C(n, q) \in (0, \infty)$. Setting $P'_k = \eta_{9/10}^{-1} \Gamma_k^{-1} \tilde{P}_k$, it follows readily from (15.5), (15.6) and (15.4) that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(P'_k \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1), P_k \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1)) &\leq C \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, P_k) d\|V_k\|(X) \quad \text{and} \\ \theta^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_{\theta}} \text{dist}^2(X, P'_k) d\|V_k\|(X) &\leq C \theta^2 \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, P_k) d\|V_k\|(X) \end{aligned}$$

for all sufficiently large k , where $C = C(n, q) \in (0, \infty)$. Thus, conclusion (a) with V_k, P_k, P'_k in place of V, P, P' and with a fixed constant $C = C(n, q) \in (0, \infty)$ holds for infinitely many k . $\square$

Theorem 15.2. *Let q be an integer ≥ 2 , $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ and suppose that the induction hypotheses (H1), (H2) hold. There exists a number $\epsilon = \epsilon(n, q, \alpha, \gamma) \in (0, 1)$ such that the following is true: If $V \in \mathcal{S}_{\alpha}$, $(\omega_n 2^n)^{-1} \|V\|(B_2^{n+1}(0)) < q + 1/2$, $(q - 1/2) \leq \omega_n^{-1} \|V\|(B_1 \times \mathbf{R}) < (q + 1/2)$ and $\hat{E}_V^2 \equiv \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} |x^1|^2 d\|V\|(X) < \epsilon$, then*

$$V \llcorner (B_{\gamma/2} \times \mathbf{R}) = \sum_{j=1}^q |\text{graph } u_j|$$

where $u_j \in C^{1,\lambda}(B_{\gamma/2})$ for each $j = 1, 2, \dots, q$, $u_1 \leq u_2 \leq \dots \leq u_q$ and

$$\sup_{B_{\gamma/2}} (|u_j| + |Du_j|) + \sup_{Y_1, Y_2 \in B_{\gamma/2}, Y_1 \neq Y_2} \frac{|Du_j(Y_1) - Du_j(Y_2)|}{|Y_1 - Y_2|^\lambda} \leq C \left(\int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} |x^1|^2 d\|V\|(X) \right)^{1/2}.$$

Here $C = C(n, q, \alpha, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$ and $\lambda = \lambda(n, q, \alpha, \gamma) \in (0, 1)$. Furthermore, for each $j = 1, 2, \dots, q$, the function u_j solves the minimal surface equation on $B_{\gamma/2}$.

Proof. Let $\tilde{\gamma} = (1 - \gamma)/4$. Let $C = C(n, q)$, $C_1 = C_1(n, q)$ and $C_2 = C_2(n, q)$ be the constants as in the conclusion of Lemma 15.1. Choose $\theta = \theta(n, q) \in (0, 1/4)$ such that $C_2 \theta^2 < 1/4$ and $\epsilon = \epsilon(n, q, \alpha, \gamma) \in (0, 1)$ such that $\epsilon < (1 + C_1)^{-1} \tilde{\gamma}^{n+2} \beta_0 / 8$ where $\beta_0 = \beta_0(n, q, \alpha, \theta)$ is as in

Lemma 15.1. Additional restrictions on ϵ will be imposed during the course of the proof, but we will choose ϵ depending only on n, q, α and γ .

Suppose that $\hat{E}_V^2 \equiv \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} |x^1|^2 d\|V\|(X) \leq \epsilon$, and let

$$\beta = \min \left\{ 4^{-1} (1 + 2C_1)^{-1} \beta_0, \quad 4^{-1} \tilde{\gamma}^n \omega_n^{-1} (2q + 1)^{-1} \beta_0, \quad 4^{-1} (2 + \omega_n (2q + 1) C_1)^{-1} \left(\frac{2\theta}{3} \right)^{n+2} \bar{\epsilon}_0, \right. \\ \left. 8^{-1} \omega_n 4^{-n} \theta^n (256\theta^{-2} + (q + 1)\bar{C})^{-1} (2 + \omega_n (2q + 1) C_1)^{-1} \right\}$$

Here $\bar{\epsilon}_0 = \epsilon_0(n, q, 5/6)$, $\bar{C} = C(n, q, 5/6)$, where $\epsilon_0 = \epsilon_0(n, q, \cdot)$ is as in Theorem 5.1 and $C = C(n, q, \cdot)$ is as in Theorem 5.1(a). Note that β depends only on n, q, α and γ . Let P_0 be any affine hyperplane such that

$$(15.7) \quad \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}^2(P_0 \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1), \{0\} \times B_1) < \beta.$$

Fix any point $Y \in B_\gamma(0)$ and let $\tilde{V} = \eta_{Y, \tilde{\gamma}} \# V$. Note then that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{E}_{\tilde{V}, P_0}^2 &\equiv \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, P_0) d\|\tilde{V}\|(X) = \tilde{\gamma}^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_{\tilde{\gamma}}(Y)} \text{dist}^2(X, Y + \tilde{\gamma}P_0) d\|V\|(X) \\ &\leq 2\tilde{\gamma}^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_{\tilde{\gamma}}(Y)} |x^1|^2 d\|V\|(X) + \\ &\quad 2\tilde{\gamma}^{-n-2} \|V\|(\mathbf{R} \times B_{\tilde{\gamma}}) \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}^2(Y + \tilde{\gamma}P_0 \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_{\tilde{\gamma}}(Y)), \{0\} \times B_{\tilde{\gamma}}(Y)) \\ (15.8) \quad &\leq 2\tilde{\gamma}^{-n-2} \hat{E}_V^2 + \tilde{\gamma}^{-n} \omega_n (2q + 1) \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}^2(P_0 \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1), \{0\} \times B_1) \leq 2\tilde{\gamma}^{-n-2} \epsilon + \beta_0/4 < \beta_0. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, assuming $\epsilon < \epsilon_0(n, q, \frac{3+\gamma}{4})$ where ϵ_0 is as in Theorem 5.1 and applying Theorem 5.1 with $\sigma = (3 + \gamma)/4$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| (\omega_n \tilde{\gamma}^n)^{-1} \|V\|(\mathbf{R} \times B_{\tilde{\gamma}}(Y)) - q \right| &= \left| (\omega_n \tilde{\gamma}^n)^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_{\tilde{\gamma}} \setminus \Sigma} \left(\sqrt{1 + |Du^j|^2} - 1 \right) dx \right. \\ &\quad \left. - (\omega_n \tilde{\gamma}^n)^{-1} (q \mathcal{H}^n(B_{\tilde{\gamma}} \cap \Sigma) - \|V\|(\mathbf{R} \times (B_{\tilde{\gamma}} \cap \Sigma))) \right| \\ &\leq (\omega_n \tilde{\gamma}^n)^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^q \int_{B_{\tilde{\gamma}} \setminus \Sigma_k} \frac{|Du^j|^2}{\sqrt{1 + |Du^j|^2}} dx + (\omega_n \tilde{\gamma}^n)^{-1} (q + 1) \tilde{C} \hat{E}_V^2 \\ &\leq (\omega_n \tilde{\gamma}^n)^{-1} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_{\tilde{\gamma}}(Y)} |\nabla^V x^1|^2 d\|V\|(X) + (\omega_n \tilde{\gamma}^n)^{-1} (q + 1) \tilde{C} \hat{E}_V^2 \\ &\leq 16\tilde{\gamma}^{-2} (\omega_n \tilde{\gamma}^n)^{-1} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_{2\tilde{\gamma}}(Y)} |x^1|^2 d\|V\|(X) + (\omega_n \tilde{\gamma}^n)^{-1} (q + 1) \tilde{C} \hat{E}_V^2 \\ (15.9) \quad &\leq (\omega_n \tilde{\gamma}^n)^{-1} (16\tilde{\gamma}^{-2} + (q + 1)\tilde{C}) \hat{E}_V^2. \end{aligned}$$

Here $\tilde{C} = C(n, q, \frac{3+\gamma}{4})$ where $C = C(n, q, \cdot)$ is as in Theorem 5.1(a), and u^j, Σ are as in Theorem 5.1; we have also used the fact that $\int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_{\tilde{\gamma}}(Y)} |\nabla^V x^1|^2 d\|V\|(X) \leq 16\tilde{\gamma}^{-2} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_{\tilde{\gamma}}(Y)} |x^1|^2 d\|V\|(X)$, which follows from (5.1). Thus if $\epsilon = \epsilon(n, q, \alpha, \gamma) \in (0, 1)$ is sufficiently small, this says that

$$(15.10) \quad q - 1/2 \leq (\omega_n)^{-1} \|\tilde{V}\|(\mathbf{R} \times B_1) < q + 1/2.$$

Since $(\omega_n 2^n)^{-1} \|\tilde{V}\|(B_2^{n+1}(0)) = (\omega_n (2\tilde{\gamma})^n)^{-1} \|V\|(B_{2\tilde{\gamma}}^{n+1}(Y)) \leq (\omega_n (2\tilde{\gamma})^n)^{-1} \|V\|(\mathbf{R} \times B_{2\tilde{\gamma}}(Y))$, the same estimate with $2\tilde{\gamma}$ in place of $\tilde{\gamma}$ shows that

$$(15.11) \quad (\omega_n 2^n)^{-1} \|\tilde{V}\|(B_2^{n+1}(0)) < q + 1/2$$

provided $\epsilon = \epsilon(n, q, \alpha, \gamma) \in (0, 1)$ is sufficiently small.

We claim that either (I) or (II) below must hold:

(I) for each $k \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$,

$$(15.12) \quad \left(\omega_n(2\theta^k)^n \right)^{-1} \|\tilde{V}\|(B_{2\theta^k}^{n+1}(0)) < q + 1/2; \quad q - 1/2 \leq (\omega_n(\theta^k)^n)^{-1} \|\tilde{V}\|(\mathbf{R} \times B_{\theta^k}) < q + 1/2;$$

there exists an affine hyperplane P_k such that, if $k \geq 1$,

$$(15.13) \quad \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}^2(P_k \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1), P_{k-1} \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1)) \leq C_1 4^{-k} \hat{E}_{\tilde{V}, P_0}^2 \quad \text{and}$$

$$(15.14) \quad \begin{aligned} & (\theta^k)^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_{\theta^k}} \text{dist}^2(X, P_k) d\|\tilde{V}\|(X) \\ & \leq 4^{-1} (\theta^{k-1})^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_{\theta^{k-1}}} \text{dist}^2(X, P_{k-1}) d\|\tilde{V}\|(X) \leq \dots \leq 4^{-k} \hat{E}_{\tilde{V}, P_0}^2. \end{aligned}$$

(II) there exists $\rho_0 \in (0, 1)$ such that $\tilde{V} \llcorner (\mathbf{R} \times B_{\rho_0}) = \sum_{j=1}^q |\text{graph } u_j|$ for functions $u_j \in C^2(B_{\rho_0}; \mathbf{R})$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, q$, satisfying $u_1 \leq u_2 \leq \dots \leq u_q$ on B_{ρ_0} ; $u_{j_0} < u_{j_0+1}$ on B_{ρ_0} for some $j_0 \in \{1, 2, \dots, q-1\}$ and

$$(15.15) \quad \begin{aligned} & \sup_{B_{\rho_0/2}} \rho_0^{-2} |u_j|^2 + |Du_j|^2 + \rho_0^2 |D^2 u_j|^2 \\ & \leq (C + 2C_1) \hat{E}_{\tilde{V}, P_0}^2 + 4 \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}^2(P_0 \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1), \{0\} \times B_1) \end{aligned}$$

for each $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, q\}$.

To see this, let k_0 be the smallest integer (≥ 1) such that alternative (I) fails to hold. If $k_0 = 1$, in view of (15.8) and (15.10), it follows directly from Lemma 15.1 applied with $\tilde{V}$ in place of V and with $P = P_0$ that (II) must hold with $\rho_0 = 1/2$. Suppose $k_0 \geq 2$. Then by assumption, the inequalities (15.12), (15.13) and (15.14) hold for each $k = 1, 2, \dots, k_0 - 1$ and consequently, by (15.7), (15.13) and the triangle inequality,

$$(15.16) \quad \begin{aligned} & \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}^2(P_{k_0-1} \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1), \{0\} \times B_1) \leq \left(\sqrt{C_1} \hat{E}_{\tilde{V}, P_0} + \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(P_0 \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1), \{0\} \times B_1) \right)^2 \\ & \leq 4C_1 \tilde{\gamma}^{-n-2} \epsilon + \beta_0/2 < \beta_0. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemma 15.1 with $\eta_{\theta^{k_0-1}} \# \tilde{V}$ in place of V and P_{k_0-1} in place of P , we see by the defining property of k_0 that $\tilde{V} \llcorner (\mathbf{R} \times B_{\theta^{k_0-1}/2}) = \sum_{j=1}^q |\text{graph } u_j|$ where $u_j \in C^2(B_{\theta^{k_0-1}/2}; \mathbf{R})$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, q$; $u_1 \leq u_2 \leq \dots \leq u_q$ on $B_{\theta^{k_0-1}/2}$; $u_j < u_{j+1}$ on $B_{\theta^{k_0-1}/2}$ for some $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, q-1\}$ and

$$(15.17) \quad \begin{aligned} & \sup_{B_{\theta^{k_0-1}/2}} (\theta^{k_0-1})^{-2} |u_j - p|^2 + |Du_j - Dp|^2 + (\theta^{k_0-1})^2 |D^2 u_j|^2 \\ & \leq C(\theta^{k_0-1})^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_{\theta^{k_0-1}}} \text{dist}^2(X, P_{k_0-1}) d\|\tilde{V}\|(X) \leq C 4^{-(k_0-1)} \hat{E}_{\tilde{V}, P_0}^2 \end{aligned}$$

for each $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, q\}$; here $p : \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is the affine function such that $\text{graph } p = P_{k_0-1}$. In view of (15.8) and (15.16), this evidently implies alternative (II) with $\rho_0 = \theta^{k_0-1}$. Thus either (I) or (II) holds as claimed.

Suppose that (I) holds for some P_0 satisfying (15.7). It is standard then that there exists a hyperplane $\tilde{P}$ with

$$(15.18) \quad \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\tilde{P} \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1), P_0 \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1)) \leq C_1 \hat{E}_{\tilde{V}, P_0}$$

such that

$$(15.19) \quad \rho^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_\rho} \text{dist}^2(X, \tilde{P}) d\|\tilde{V}\|(X) \leq C_3 \rho^{2\mu} \hat{E}_{\tilde{V}, P_0}^2$$

for each $\rho \in (0, 1)$, where $C_3 = C_3(n, q) \in (0, \infty)$ and $\mu = \mu(n, q) \in (0, 1)$. Note that $\tilde{P}$ does not depend on P_0 , nor do the constants C_3 and μ . Moreover, in this case, we claim that we have for each $\rho \in (0, 1/4)$ that

$$(15.20) \quad (\omega_n(2\rho)^n)^{-1} \|\tilde{V}\|(B_{2\rho}^{n+1}(0)) < q + 1/2 \quad \text{and} \quad q - 1/2 \leq (\omega_n \rho^n)^{-1} \|\tilde{V}\|(\mathbf{R} \times B_\rho) < q + 1/2.$$

To see this, given $\rho \in (0, 1/4)$, choose k such that $\theta^{k+1} \leq 4\rho < \theta^k$ and note by (15.12), (15.13), (15.14) and the triangle inequality that

$$(15.21) \quad \begin{aligned} & \left(\theta^k \right)^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_{\theta^k}} |x^1|^2 d\|\tilde{V}\|(X) \\ & \leq 2(2 + \omega_n(2q + 1)C_1)(\tilde{\gamma}^{-n-2} \hat{E}_V^2 + \text{dist}^2(P_0 \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1), \{0\} \times B_1)) \\ & \leq 2(2 + \omega_n(2q + 1)C_1)(\tilde{\gamma}^{-n-2} \epsilon + \beta) \end{aligned}$$

so provided $\epsilon = \epsilon(n, q, \alpha, \gamma) \in (0, 1)$ is sufficiently small, we may, in view of (15.12), apply Theorem 5.1 with $\eta_{\theta^k} \# \tilde{V}$ in place of V , $\sigma = 5/6$ and estimate exactly as in (15) (with $\eta_{\theta^k} \# \tilde{V}$ in place of V , $Y = 0$ and $\theta^{-k}\rho$ in place of $\tilde{\gamma}$) to deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \left(\omega_n \left(\theta^{-k} \rho \right)^n \right)^{-1} \|\eta_{\theta^k} \# \tilde{V}\|(\mathbf{R} \times B_{\theta^{-k}\rho}(Y)) - q \right| \\ & \leq 2 \left(\omega_n \left(\theta^{-k} \rho \right)^n \right)^{-1} \left(16 \left(\theta^{-k} \rho \right)^{-2} + (q + 1)\overline{C} \right) (2 + \omega_n(2q + 1)C_1) (\tilde{\gamma}^{-n-2} \epsilon + \beta) \\ & \leq 2\omega_n^{-1} 4^n \theta^{-n} (256\theta^{-2} + (q + 1)\overline{C}) (2 + \omega_n(2q + 1)C_1) (\tilde{\gamma}^{-n-2} \epsilon + \beta). \end{aligned}$$

(Recall that $\overline{C} = C(n, q, 5/6)$ where $C = C(n, q, \cdot)$ is as in Theorem 5.1(a)). From this, (15.11) and the monotonicity formula, we deduce that (15.20) holds provided $\epsilon = \epsilon(n, q, \alpha, \gamma) \in (0, 1)$ is sufficiently small. It then follows, if alternative (I) holds for some P_0 satisfying (15.7), that $\text{spt} \|\tilde{V}\| \cap \pi^{-1}(0)$ consists of a single point ($= \tilde{P} \cap \pi^{-1}(0)$); to see this, first note that $\text{spt} \|\tilde{V}\| \cap \pi^{-1}(0) \neq \emptyset$ by the second inequality in (15.20). Let $Z \in \text{spt} \|\tilde{V}\| \cap \pi^{-1}(0)$ and $\mathbf{C}_Z$ be a tangent cone to $\tilde{V}$ at Z . Thus $\eta_{Z, \sigma_j} \# \tilde{V} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}_Z$ for some sequence of numbers $\sigma_j \rightarrow 0^+$, and by (15.19), $\text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\text{spt} \|\eta_{Z, \sigma_j} \# \tilde{V}\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_{1/2}), \sigma_j^{-1}(\tilde{P} - Z) \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_{1/2})) \rightarrow 0$, which can only be true if $Z \in \tilde{P}$. But by (15.18), $\tilde{P} \cap \pi^{-1}(0)$ consists of a single point.

Thus if alternative (I) holds for some P_0 satisfying (15.7), then, since alternative (II) implies that $\text{spt} \|\tilde{V}\| \cap \pi^{-1}(0)$ has at least two distinct points, (I) must hold for all P_0 satisfying (15.7). Taking $P_0 = \mathbf{R}^n \times \{0\}$, we deduce from (15.18) and (15.19) that

$$(15.22) \quad \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\tilde{P} \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1), \{0\} \times B_1) \leq C_1 \tilde{\gamma}^{-n-2} \hat{E}_V^2 \leq C_1 \tilde{\gamma}^{-n-2} \epsilon \quad \text{and}$$

$$(15.23) \quad \rho^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_\rho} \text{dist}^2(X, \tilde{P}) d\|\tilde{V}\|(X) \leq C_3 \tilde{\gamma}^{-n-2} \hat{E}_V^2 \leq C_3 \tilde{\gamma}^{-n-2} \epsilon$$

for $\rho \in (0, 1)$. So if we choose $\epsilon = \epsilon(n, q, \alpha, \gamma)$ such that $C_1 \tilde{\gamma}^{-n-2} \epsilon < \beta$ we may in particular take $P_0 = \tilde{P}$ in (15.19). Thus we have so far established the following:

Given q, α, γ as in the theorem and that the induction hypotheses (H1), (H2) hold, there exists $\epsilon = \epsilon(n, q, \alpha, \gamma) \in (0, 1)$ such that if $V \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$ satisfies the hypotheses of the theorem, $Y \in B_\gamma$, $\tilde{V} = \eta_{Y, \tilde{\gamma}} \# V$ where $\tilde{\gamma} = (1 - \gamma)/4$, then either alternative (I) above holds for all affine hyperplanes

P_0 satisfying (15.7) or alternative (II) above holds for all such P_0 ; furthermore, if alternative (I) holds, then the bounds (15.20) are satisfied for each $\rho \in (0, 1/4)$, the estimates (15.22), (15.23) are satisfied and

$$(15.24) \quad \rho^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_\rho} \text{dist}^2(X, \tilde{P}) d\|\tilde{V}\|(X) \leq C_3 \rho^{2\mu} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, \tilde{P}) d\|\tilde{V}\|(X)$$

for $\rho \in (0, 1)$, where $\tilde{P}$ is a (uniquely determined) affine hyperplane, $C_3 = C_3(n, q) \in (0, \infty)$ and $\mu = \mu(n, q) \in (0, 1)$.

Now suppose the hypotheses of the theorem are satisfied with a number $\epsilon' = \epsilon'(n, q, \alpha, \gamma) \in (0, \epsilon)$ in place of ϵ , and that alternative (I) (with $Y \in B_\gamma$, $\tilde{V} = \eta_{Y, \tilde{\gamma}} \# V$ as above) still holds. Then for any $\rho \in (0, 1/4)$ we have by (15.22), (15.23), (15.20) and the triangle inequality that

$$\rho^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_\rho} |x^1|^2 d\|\tilde{V}\|(X) \leq (2C_3 + \omega_n(2q+1)C_1) \tilde{\gamma}^{-n-2} \hat{E}_V^2 < 2(C_3 + C_1)\epsilon'.$$

Thus if we choose $\epsilon' = \epsilon'(n, q, \alpha, \gamma)$ sufficiently small, we may, in view of this and (15.20), repeat the argument leading to (15.24) with $\eta_\rho \# \tilde{V}$ (for which alternative (I) must hold) in place of $\tilde{V}$; by applying (15.24) with $\eta_\rho \# \tilde{V}$ in place of $\tilde{V}$ and $\rho^{-1}\sigma$ in place of ρ , we deduce that if alternative (I) holds for some P_0 satisfying (15.7), then there exists a unique affine hyperplane $\tilde{P}$ satisfying (15.22) and

$$(15.25) \quad \sigma^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_\sigma} \text{dist}^2(X, \tilde{P}) d\|\tilde{V}\|(X) \leq C_3 \left(\frac{\sigma}{\rho}\right)^{2\mu} \rho^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_\rho} \text{dist}^2(X, \tilde{P}) d\|\tilde{V}\|(X)$$

for each $0 < \sigma < \rho < 1/4$.

If on the other hand (I) fails for some P_0 satisfying (15.7), then it fails with $P_0 = \{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^n$ in which case (by (II)) there exists $\rho_0 \in (0, 1)$ such that $\tilde{V} \llcorner (\mathbf{R} \times B_{\rho_0}) = \sum_{j=1}^q |\text{graph } u_j|$ for functions $u_j \in C^2(B_{\rho_0}; \mathbf{R})$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, q$ satisfying $u_1 \leq u_2 \leq \dots \leq u_q$ on B_{ρ_0} ; $u_j < u_{j+1}$ on B_{ρ_0} for some $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, q-1\}$ and

$$\sup_{B_{\rho_0/2}} \rho_0^{-2} |u_j|^2 + |Du_j|^2 + \rho_0^2 |D^2 u_j|^2 \leq (C + 2C_1) \tilde{\gamma}^{-n-2} \hat{E}_V^2$$

for each $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, q\}$.

Thus we have shown that if the hypotheses of the theorem are satisfied with sufficiently small $\epsilon' = \epsilon'(n, q, \gamma) \in (0, 1)$ in place of ϵ , then for each point $Y \in B_\gamma$, precisely one of the following alternatives (I_Y) and (II_Y) must hold:

(I_Y) there exists an affine hyperplane P_Y with

$$(15.26) \quad \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}^2(P_Y \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_1(Y)), \{0\} \times B_1(Y)) \leq C_1 \tilde{\gamma}^{-n-2} \hat{E}_V^2$$

such that

$$(15.27) \quad \sigma^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_\sigma(Y)} \text{dist}^2(X, P_Y) d\|V\|(X) \leq C_3 \left(\frac{\sigma}{\rho}\right)^{2\mu} \rho^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_\rho(Y)} \text{dist}^2(X, P_Y) d\|V\|(X)$$

for each $0 < \sigma < \rho < \tilde{\gamma}/4$, where $C_3 = C_3(n, q) \in (0, \infty)$ and $\mu = \mu(n, q) \in (0, 1)$, or

(II_Y) there exists $\rho_Y \in (0, 1/2]$ such that $V \llcorner (\mathbf{R} \times B_{\rho_Y}(Y)) = \sum_{j=1}^q |\text{graph } u_j^Y|$ for functions $u_j^Y \in C^2(B_{\rho_Y}(Y); \mathbf{R})$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, q$, satisfying $u_1^Y \leq u_2^Y \leq \dots \leq u_q^Y$ on $B_{\rho_Y}(Y)$; $u_{j_0}^Y < u_{j_0+1}^Y$ on $B_{\rho_Y}(Y)$ for some $j_0 \in \{1, 2, \dots, q-1\}$ and

$$(15.28) \quad \sup_{B_{\rho_Y}(Y)} \rho_Y^{-2} |u_j^Y|^2 + |Du_j^Y|^2 + \rho_Y^2 |D^2 u_j^Y|^2 \leq (C + 2C_1) \tilde{\gamma}^{-n-2} \hat{E}_V^2$$

for each $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, q\}$, where $C = C(n, q) \in (0, \infty)$.

Let $\Omega = \{Y \in B_\gamma : (\text{I}_Y) \text{ fails}\}$. Since $u_j^Y < u_{j+1}^Y$ on $B_{\rho_Y}(Y)$ for some j whenever (II_Y) holds, it follows that Ω is an open set. Hence, since for every $Y \in \Omega$, each of the functions u_j^Y as in (II_Y) solves the minimal surface equation on $B_{\rho_Y}(Y)$, by unique continuation of solutions to the minimal surface equation, we see that

$$(15.29) \quad V \llcorner (\mathbf{R} \times \Omega) = \sum_{j=1}^q |\text{graph } u_j|$$

for functions $u_j \in C^2(\Omega; \mathbf{R})$, solving the minimal surface equation on Ω and satisfying $u_1 \leq u_2 \leq \dots \leq u_q$ on Ω ; $u_j < u_{j+1}$ for some $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, q-1\}$ in each connected component of Ω (by the maximum principle) and

$$(15.30) \quad \sup_\Omega |u_j|^2 + |Du_j|^2 \leq (C + 2C_1) \tilde{\gamma}^{-n-2} \hat{E}_V^2 \leq (C + 2C_1) \tilde{\gamma}^{-n-2} \epsilon'$$

for each $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, q\}$. This means that for each affine function $p : \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ with $\sup_{B_1} |p|^2 \leq C_1 \tilde{\gamma}^{-n-2} \epsilon'$ and each $j = 1, 2, \dots, q$, the function $w_j = u_j - p \in C^2(\Omega)$ solves a uniformly elliptic equation with smooth coefficients on Ω of the type $a_{\ell k} D_\ell D_k w_j + b_\ell D_\ell w_j = 0$ with $\sup_\Omega |a_{\ell k}| + |b_\ell| \leq \kappa$, $\kappa = \kappa(n, q, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$. By using the standard second derivative estimates for solutions to such equations, we conclude that for each $Y \in \Omega$, each $j = 1, 2, \dots, q$ and each affine function $p_j : \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ with $\sup_{B_1} |p_j|^2 \leq C_1 \tilde{\gamma}^{-n-2} \epsilon'$,

$$(15.31) \quad \sigma^{-n-2} \int_{B_\sigma(Y)} |u_j - p_j^Y|^2 \leq C_4 \left(\frac{\sigma}{\rho} \right)^2 \rho^{-n-2} \int_{B_\rho(Y)} |u_j - p_j|^2$$

for $0 < \sigma \leq \rho/2 < \frac{1}{2} \text{dist}(Y, B_\gamma \setminus \Omega)$, where $C_4 = C_4(n, q, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$ and $p_j^Y(X) = u_j(Y) + Du_j(Y) \cdot (X - Y)$.

Since for each $Y \in B_\gamma \setminus \Omega$, $\text{spt } \|V\| \cap \pi^{-1}(Y)$ consists of a single point $(z_Y, Y) (= P_Y \cap \pi^{-1}(Y))$, for each $j = 1, 2, \dots, q$, we may extend u_j to all of B_γ by setting $u_j(Y) = z_Y$ for $Y \in B_\gamma \setminus \Omega$. Then by (15.29),

$$V \llcorner (\mathbf{R} \times B_\gamma) = \sum_{j=1}^q |\text{graph } u_j|.$$

Letting $\Sigma \subset B_\gamma$ be as in Theorem 5.1 taken with $\sigma = \gamma$, we see from (15.26) and (15.27) that $\Sigma \subset \Omega$ provided $\epsilon' = \epsilon'(n, q, \alpha, \gamma)$ is sufficiently small. Hence, by Theorem 5.1, $u_j|_{B_\gamma \setminus \Omega} : B_\gamma \setminus \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is Lipschitz with Lipschitz constant $\leq 1/2$, so that by (15.27), (15.30) and the area formula, it follows that

$$(15.32) \quad \sigma^{-n-2} \int_{B_\sigma(Y)} |u_j - p^Y|^2 = 2C_3 \left(\frac{\sigma}{\rho} \right)^{2\alpha} \rho^{-n-2} \int_{B_\rho(Y)} |u_j - p^Y|^2$$

for each $Y \in B_\gamma \setminus \Omega$ and each σ, ρ with $0 < \sigma < \rho < \tilde{\gamma}/4$, where and $p^Y : \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is the affine function such that $\text{graph } p^Y = P_Y$.

In view of (15.31) and (15.32), we conclude from Lemma 4.3 that $u_j \in C^{1,\lambda}(B_{\gamma/2})$ with

$$\sup_{B_{\gamma/2}} |u_j|^2 + |Du_j|^2 + \sup_{Y_1, Y_2 \in B_{\gamma/2}, Y_1 \neq Y_2} \frac{|Du_j(Y_1) - Du_j(Y_2)|^2}{|Y_1 - Y_2|^{2\lambda}} \leq C_5 \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} |x^1|^2 d\|V\|(X)$$

for each $j = 1, 2, \dots, q$, where $C_5 = C_5(n, q, \gamma) \in (0, \infty)$ and $\lambda = \lambda(n, q, \gamma) \in (0, 1)$.

To show that, for each $j = 1, 2, \dots, q$, u_j solves the minimal surface equation on $B_{\gamma/2}$, we argue as follows: We know that on the open set Ω , each u_j solves the minimal surface equation, and on

$B_\gamma \setminus \Omega$, the functions u_j all agree, so if $B_{\gamma/2} \subseteq \Omega$ or $B_{\gamma/2} \cap \Omega = \emptyset$, there is nothing further to prove. Suppose $\partial\Omega \cap B_{\gamma/2} \neq \emptyset$, and pick any connected component Ω' of Ω such that $\partial\Omega' \cap B_{\gamma/2} \neq \emptyset$. Let $B \subset \Omega'$ be an open ball such that $\overline{B} \cap \partial\Omega' \cap B_{\gamma/2} \neq \emptyset$ and let $x_0 \in \partial B \cap \partial\Omega' \cap B_{\gamma/2}$. Pick any $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, q-1\}$ and let $w_j = u_{j+1} - u_j$. Then w_j solves in B a uniformly elliptic equation with smooth coefficients. Since $w_j \in C^1(B_{\gamma/2})$, $w_j \geq 0$ and $w_j(x_0) = 0$, it follows that $Dw_j(x_0) = 0$, and hence by the Hopf boundary point lemma, $w_j \equiv 0$ in B , and by unique continuation of solutions of the minimal surface equation, $w_j \equiv 0$ in Ω' . Thus we conclude that in case $\partial\Omega \cap B_{\gamma/2} \neq \emptyset$, all of the u_j 's must be identical to one another and solve the minimal surface equation on $B_{\gamma/2}$. $\square$

16. THE MINIMUM DISTANCE THEOREM

Let q be an integer ≥ 2 and let $\mathbf{C}_0$ be a stationary integral hypercone in $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ such that $\text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}_0\|$ consists of at least 3 distinct half-hyperplanes of $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ meeting along a common $(n-1)$ -dimensional subspace $L_{\mathbf{C}_0}$ of $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$. In this section we will use the multiplicity q case of the Sheetting Theorem (Theorem 15.2) to establish, subject to the induction hypotheses (H1), (H2), Theorem 3.3 whenever

$$(16.1) \quad \Theta(\|\mathbf{C}_0\|, 0) \in \{q + 1/2, q + 1\};$$

our argument will also establish Theorem 3.3 in case $\Theta(\|\mathbf{C}_0\|, 0) \in \{3/2, 2\}$, with no further hypotheses. (See the Remark at the end of the section.)

Suppose $\mathbf{C}_0$ satisfies (16.1), and without loss of generality assume that $L_{\mathbf{C}_0} = \{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1}$. Thus, $\text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}_0\| = \text{spt } \|\Delta_0\| \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1}$, where Δ_0 is a 1-dimensional stationary cone in $\mathbf{R}^2$, whence $\Delta_0 = \sum_{j=1}^{m_0} q_j^{(0)} |R_j^{(0)}|$ and

$$(16.2) \quad \mathbf{C}_0 = \sum_{j=1}^{m_0} q_j^{(0)} |H_j|$$

where m_0 is an integer ≥ 3 , $q_j^{(0)}$ is a positive integer for each $j = 1, 2, \dots, m_0$, $R_j^{(0)} = \{t\mathbf{w}_j^{(0)} : t > 0\}$ for some unit vector $\mathbf{w}_j^{(0)} \in \mathbf{S}^1 \subset \mathbf{R}^2$ with $\mathbf{w}_j^{(0)} \neq \mathbf{w}_k^{(0)}$ for $j \neq k$, and $H_j^{(0)} = R_j \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1}$. Stationarity of $\mathbf{C}_0$ is equivalent to the requirement

$$(16.3) \quad \sum_{j=1}^{m_0} q_j^{(0)} \mathbf{w}_j^{(0)} = 0.$$

Since, by (16.1),

$$(16.4) \quad \sum_{j=1}^{m_0} q_j^{(0)} \in \{2q + 1, 2q + 2\},$$

we see readily from (16.3) that

$$(16.5) \quad q_j^{(0)} \leq q \quad \text{for each } j = 1, 2, \dots, m_0.$$

The theorem we wish to prove is the following:

Theorem 16.1. *Let q be an integer ≥ 2 , $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and suppose that the induction hypotheses (H1), (H2) hold. Let $\mathbf{C}_0$ be a stationary cone as in (16.2), where $m_0 \geq 3$ and $H_j^{(0)} \neq H_k^{(0)}$ for $j \neq k$, and suppose that $\mathbf{C}_0$ satisfies (16.1). For each $\gamma \in (0, 1/2)$, there exists a number $\epsilon_0 = \epsilon_0(n, q, \alpha, \gamma, \mathbf{C}_0) \in (0, 1)$ such that if $V \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$, $\Theta(\|V\|, 0) \geq \Theta(\|\mathbf{C}_0\|, 0)$ and $(\omega_n 2^n)^{-1} \|V\|(B_2^{n+1}(0)) < \Theta(\|\mathbf{C}_0\|, 0) + \gamma$, then*

$$\text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\text{spt } \|V\| \cap B_1^{n+1}(0), \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}_0\| \cap B_1^{n+1}(0)) \geq \epsilon_0.$$

Notation: Let $\mathbf{C}_0$ be as in (16.2), with the associated unit vectors $\mathbf{w}_j^{(0)} \in \mathbf{R}^2$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, m_0$, as described above. We shall use the following notation in connection with $\mathbf{C}_0$:

$$\sigma_0 = \max \{ \mathbf{w}_j^{(0)} \cdot \mathbf{w}_k^{(0)} : j, k = 1, 2, \dots, m, j \neq k \}.$$

$N(H_j^{(0)})$ is the conical neighborhood of $H_j^{(0)}$ defined by

$$N(H_j^{(0)}) = \left\{ (x, y) \in \mathbf{R}^2 \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1} : x \cdot \mathbf{w}_j^{(0)} > \sqrt{\frac{1+\sigma_0}{2}} |x| \right\}.$$

Given $\mathbf{C}_0$ as above, $\mathcal{K}$ denotes the family of hypercones $\mathbf{C}$ of $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ of the form

$$(16.6) \quad \mathbf{C} = \sum_{j=1}^{m_0} \sum_{\ell=1}^{q_j^{(0)}} |H_{j,\ell}|,$$

where $H_{j,\ell}$ are half-hyperplanes of $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ meeting along $\{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1}$ with $H_{j,\ell} \in N(H_j^{(0)})$ for each $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, m_0\}$, $\ell \in \{1, 2, \dots, q_j^{(0)}\}$, and $H_{j,1}, H_{j,2}, \dots, H_{j,q_j^{(0)}}$ not necessarily distinct for each $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, m_0\}$. Note that unless otherwise specified, we do *not* assume a cone $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{K}$ is stationary in $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$.

For $p \in \{m_0, m_0 + 1, \dots, 2q\}$, $\mathcal{K}(p)$ denotes the set of cones $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{K}$ as in (16.6) such that the number of *distinct* elements in the set $\{H_{j,\ell} : j = 1, 2, \dots, m_0, \ell = 1, 2, \dots, q_j^{(0)}\}$ is p . Thus

$$\mathcal{K} = \cup_{p=m_0}^{2\Theta(\|\mathbf{C}_0\|, 0)} \mathcal{K}(p).$$

$$r(X) = \text{dist}(X, \{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1}) \text{ for } X \in \mathbf{R}^{n+1}.$$

For the rest of this Section, we shall fix $\mathbf{C}_0$ as above, with fixed labeling of the elements of the set $\{H_j^{(0)} : j = 1, \dots, m_0\}$ of constituent half-hyperplanes of $\text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}_0\|$ and with $q_j^{(0)}$, $1 \leq j \leq m_0$, denoting the multiplicity on $H_j^{(0)}$.

For $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, $\gamma \in (0, 1/2)$ and appropriate $\epsilon \in (0, 1/2)$, consider the following:

Hypotheses 16.2.

- (1) $V \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$, $0 \in \text{spt } \|V\|$, $\Theta(\|V\|, 0) \geq \Theta(\|\mathbf{C}_0\|, 0)$, $(\omega_n 2^n)^{-1} \|V\|(B_2^{n+1}(0)) < \Theta(\|\mathbf{C}_0\|, 0) + \gamma$.
- (2) $\mathbf{C} = \sum_{j=1}^{m_0} \sum_{\ell=1}^{q_j^{(0)}} |H_{j,\ell}| \in \mathcal{K}$, where $H_{j,\ell}$ are half-hyperplanes of $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ meeting along $\{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1}$ with $H_{j,\ell} \in N(H_j^{(0)})$ for each $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, m_0\}$ and $\ell \in \{1, 2, \dots, q_j^{(0)}\}$.
- (3) $\text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}\| \cap B_1^{n+1}(0), \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}_0\| \cap B_1^{n+1}(0)) < \epsilon$.
- (4)

$$\int_{B_1^{n+1}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}\|) d\|V\|(X) < \epsilon.$$

- (5) For each $j = 1, 2, \dots, m_0$,

$$\|V\|((B_{1/2}^{n+1}(0) \setminus \{r(X) < 1/8\}) \cap N(H_j^{(0)})) \geq q_j^{(0)} \mathcal{H}^n((B_{1/2}^{n+1}(0) \setminus \{r(X) < 1/8\}) \cap H_j^{(0)}).$$

Remarks: (1) We have the following:

For each $\gamma \in (0, 1/2)$ and $\tau \in (0, 1/8)$, there exists $\epsilon = \epsilon(n, q, \tau, \gamma, \mathbf{C}_0) \in (0, 1)$ such that if Hypotheses 16.2(1)-(4) hold, then

$$\{Z \in \text{spt } \|V\| \cap B_{15/16}^{n+1}(0) : \Theta(\|V\|, Z) \geq q + 1/2\} \subset \{X \in \mathbf{R}^{n+1} : r(X) < \tau\}.$$

To see this, argue by contradiction, using the Constancy Theorem, upper semi-continuity of the density function $\Theta(\cdot, \cdot)$ and (16.5).

(2) Theorem 15.2 implies the following:

Let q be an integer ≥ 2 . If the induction hypotheses (H1), (H2) hold, $V \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$, $\Omega \subseteq B_2^{n+1}(0)$ is open and $\Theta(\|V\|, Z) < q + 1/2$ for each $Z \in \text{spt } \|V\| \cap \Omega$, then $\mathcal{H}^{n-7+\gamma}(\text{sing } V \llcorner \Omega) = 0$ for each $\gamma > 0$ if $n \geq 7$ and $\text{sing } V \llcorner \Omega = \emptyset$ if $2 \leq n \leq 6$.

This can be seen by reasoning exactly as in Remarks (2) and (3) of Section 7, with the additional help of Theorem 15.2.

With the notation as above, for $V \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$, $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{K}$ as in Hypotheses 16.2 and appropriate $\beta \in (0, 1/2)$, we will also need to consider the following:

Hypothesis ($\dagger$): *Either (i) or (ii) below holds:*

- (i) $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{K}(m_0)$.
- (ii) $2\Theta(\|\mathbf{C}_0\|, 0) \geq m_0 + 1$, $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{K}(p)$ for some $p \in \{m_0 + 1, m_0 + 2, \dots, 2\Theta(\|\mathbf{C}_0\|, 0)\}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B_1^{n+1}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}\|) d\|V\|(X) + \int_{B_1^{n+1}(0) \setminus \{r(X) < 1/16\}} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|V\|) d\|\mathbf{C}\|(X) \\ & \leq \beta \inf_{\tilde{\mathbf{C}} \in \cup_{j=m_0}^{p-1} \mathcal{K}(j)} \left(\int_{B_1^{n+1}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\tilde{\mathbf{C}}\|) d\|V\|(X) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \int_{B_1^{n+1}(0) \setminus \{r(X) < 1/16\}} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|V\|) d\|\tilde{\mathbf{C}}\|(X) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Remark: If Hypotheses 16.2, Hypothesis ($\dagger$) for some $\beta \in (0, 1/2)$ are satisfied, and if $\mathbf{C}' \in \mathcal{K}$ is such that $\text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}'\| = \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}\|$, then, Hypotheses 16.2, Hypothesis ($\dagger$) taken with $\mathbf{C}'$ in place of $\mathbf{C}$ and $2q\beta$ in place of β will be satisfied.

The basic L^2 -estimates of [[Sim93], Theorem 3.1], given in Theorem 16.2 and Corollary 16.3 below, hold under our assumptions, namely, the induction hypotheses (H1), (H2), Hypotheses 16.2 and Hypothesis ($\dagger$):

Theorem 16.2. *Let q be an integer ≥ 2 , $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, $\gamma \in (0, 1/2)$, $\mu \in (0, 1)$ and $\tau \in (0, 1/8)$. Suppose that the induction hypotheses (H1), (H2) hold. Let $\mathbf{C}_0$ be a stationary cone as above (in particular with $\Theta(\|\mathbf{C}_0\|, 0) \in \{q + 1/2, q + 1\}$). There exist numbers $\epsilon_0 = \epsilon_0(n, q, \alpha, \gamma, \tau, \mathbf{C}_0) \in (0, 1/2)$, $\beta_0 = \beta_0(n, q, \alpha, \gamma, \tau, \mathbf{C}_0) \in (0, 1/2)$ such that if $V \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$, $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{K}$ satisfy Hypotheses 16.2 with ϵ_0 in place of ϵ and Hypothesis ($\dagger$) with β_0 in place of β , then, after taking appropriate $\mathbf{C}' \in \mathcal{K}$ with $\text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}'\| = \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}\|$ in place of $\mathbf{C}$, relabeling $\mathbf{C}'$ as $\mathbf{C}$ (see the preceding Remark) and writing $\mathbf{C} = \sum_{j=1}^{m_0} \sum_{\ell=1}^{q_j^{(0)}} |H_{j,\ell}|$ where $H_{j,\ell}$ are half-hyperplanes of $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ meeting along $\{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1}$ with*

$H_{j,\ell} \in N(H_j^{(0)})$ for each $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, m_0\}$ and $\ell \in \{1, 2, \dots, q_j^{(0)}\}$, the following hold:

- (a) $V \llcorner (B_{7/8}^{n+1}(0) \setminus \{r(X) < \tau\}) = \sum_{j=1}^{m_0} \sum_{\ell=1}^{q_j^{(0)}} |\text{graph } u_{j,\ell}|$ where
 $u_{j,\ell} \in C^2(B_{7/8}^{n+1}(0) \cap H_{j,\ell} \setminus \{r(X) < \tau\}; H_{j,\ell}^\perp)$ for $1 \leq j \leq m_0$, $1 \leq \ell \leq q_j^{(0)}$,
 $u_{j,\ell}$ solves the minimal surface equation on $B_{7/8}^{n+1}(0) \cap H_{j,\ell} \setminus \{r(X) < \tau\}$ and
 $\text{dist}(X + u_{j,\ell}(X), \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}\|) = |u_{j,\ell}(X)|$ for $X \in B_{7/8}^{n+1}(0) \cap H_{j,\ell} \setminus \{r(X) < \tau\}$;
- (b) $\int_{B_{3/4}^{n+1}(0)} \frac{|X^\perp|^2}{|X|^{n+2}} d\|V\|(X) \leq C \int_{B_1^{n+1}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}\|) d\|V\|(X);$
- (c) $\sum_{j=3}^{n+1} \int_{B_{3/4}^{n+1}(0)} |e_j^\perp|^2 d\|V\|(X) \leq C \int_{B_1^{n+1}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}\|) d\|V\|(X);$
- (d) $\int_{B_{3/4}^{n+1}(0)} \frac{\text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}\|)}{|X|^{n+2-\mu}} d\|V\|(X) \leq C_1 \int_{B_1^{n+1}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}\|) d\|V\|(X).$

Here $C = C(n, \alpha, \gamma, \mathbf{C}_0) \in (0, \infty)$ and $C_1 = C_1(n, \alpha, \gamma, \mu, \mathbf{C}_0) \in (0, \infty)$. In particular, C, C_1 do not depend on τ .

Proof. Note first that by Remark (1) following Hypotheses 16.2, provided $\epsilon_0 = \epsilon_0(n, q, \alpha, \tau, \mathbf{C}_0)$ is sufficiently small, we have that $\Theta(\|V\|, Z) < q+1/2$ for each $Z \in \text{spt } \|V\| \cap B_{15/16}^{n+1}(0) \setminus \{r(X) < \tau/2\}$, and hence by Remark (2) following Hypotheses 16.2, we may apply Theorem 3.4 to conclude that

$$V \llcorner \left(B_{7/8}^{n+1}(0) \setminus \{r(X) < \tau/2\} \right) = \sum_{j=1}^{m_0} \sum_{\ell=1}^{q_j^{(0)}} |\text{graph } \tilde{u}_{j,\ell}|,$$

where for each $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, m_0\}$ and $\ell \in \{1, 2, \dots, q_j^{(0)}\}$,

$$\tilde{u}_{j,\ell} \in C^2 \left(\left(B_{7/8}^{n+1}(0) \cap H_j^{(0)} \setminus \{r(X) < \tau/2\} \right); \left(H_j^{(0)} \right)^\perp \right)$$

and $\tilde{u}_{j,\ell}$ are solutions to the minimal surface equation over $H_j^{(0)} \cap \left(B_{7/8}^{n+1}(0) \setminus \{r(X) < \tau/2\} \right)$ with small C^2 norm. Here we have also used Hypotheses 16.2(5). So if $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{K}(m_0)$, then the desired conclusions in part (a) readily follow because then $\mathbf{C} = \sum_{j=1}^{m_0} q_j^{(0)} |H'_j|$ for distinct half-hyperplanes H'_j meeting along $\{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1}$, which, by Hypotheses 16.2(3), satisfy $\text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(H'_j \cap B_1^{n+1}(0), H_j^{(0)} \cap B_1^{n+1}(0)) < \epsilon_0$ for each $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, m_0\}$. Else we must have that $2\Theta(\|\mathbf{C}_0\|, 0) \geq m_0 + 1$ and that $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{K}(p)$ for some $p \in \{m_0 + 1, m_0 + 2, \dots, 2\Theta(\|\mathbf{C}_0\|, 0)\}$. For each $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, m_0\}$, let $q'_j \in \{1, 2, \dots, q_j^{(0)}\}$ be the number of distinct elements in the set $\{H_{j,1}, H_{j,2}, \dots, H_{j,q_j^{(0)}}\}$ and label them $H'_{j,\ell'}$, $\ell' = 1, 2, \dots, q'_j$. Let $\mathbf{w}'_{j,\ell'} \in \mathbf{R}^2$ be the unit vector such that $H'_{j,\ell'} = \{(t\mathbf{w}'_{j,\ell'}, y) : t > 0, y \in \mathbf{R}^{n-1}\}$. Provided that $\beta_0 = \beta_0(\alpha, \gamma, \mathbf{C}_0) \in (0, 1/2)$ is sufficiently small, it follows from the definition of $\mathcal{K}$, Hypotheses 16.2(3) and Hypothesis $(\star)$ (ii) that for each $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, m_0\}$ and $\ell'_1, \ell'_2 \in \{1, 2, \dots, q'_j\}$,

$$|\mathbf{w}'_{j,\ell'_1} - \mathbf{w}'_{j,\ell'_2}| \geq c \mathcal{Q}'_V$$

for some constant $c = c(\alpha, \gamma, \mathbf{C}_0) \in (0, \infty)$, where

$$\mathcal{Q}'_V = \inf_{\tilde{\mathbf{C}} \in \cup_{j=m_0}^{p-1} \mathcal{K}(j)} \left(\int_{B_1^{n+1}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\tilde{\mathbf{C}}\|) d\|V\|(X) + \int_{B_1^{n+1}(0) \setminus \{r(X) < 1/16\}} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|V\|) d\|\tilde{\mathbf{C}}\|(X) \right).$$

By exactly the same inductive argument of Theorem 10.1(a), the conclusions in (a) now follows from this provided $\epsilon_0 = \epsilon_0(n, \alpha, \gamma, \tau, \mathbf{C}_0), \beta_0 = \beta_0(n, \alpha, \gamma, \tau, \mathbf{C}_0) \in (0, 1/2)$ are sufficiently small.

The rest of the theorem is proved by arguing as in [Sim93], Theorem 3.1. $\square$

Corollary 16.3. *Let q be an integer ≥ 2 , $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, $\gamma \in (0, 1/2)$, $\mu \in (0, 1)$ and $\tau \in (0, 1/8)$. Suppose that the induction hypotheses (H1), (H2) hold and let $\mathbf{C}_0$ be a stationary cone as above. For each $\rho \in (0, 1/4]$, There exist numbers $\epsilon = \epsilon(n, \alpha, \gamma, \tau, \rho, \mathbf{C}_0) \in (0, 1/2)$, $\beta = \beta(n, \alpha, \gamma, \tau, \rho, \mathbf{C}_0) \in (0, 1/2)$ such that if $V \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$, $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{K}$ satisfy Hypotheses 16.2 and Hypothesis $(\dagger)$, then for each $Z = (\zeta^1, \zeta^2, \eta) \in \text{spt } \|V\| \cap (B_{3/8}^{n+1}(0))$ with $\Theta(\|V\|, Z) \geq \Theta(\|\mathbf{C}_0\|, 0)$, we have the following:*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(a)} \quad & |\zeta^1|^2 + |\zeta^2|^2 \leq C \int_{B_1^{n+1}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}\|) d\|V\|(X). \\ \text{(b)} \quad & \int_{B_{\rho/2}^{n+1}(Z)} \frac{\text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|T_Z \# \mathbf{C}\|)}{|X - Z|^{n+2-\mu}} d\|V\|(X) \leq C_1 \rho^{-n-2+\mu} \int_{B_\rho^{n+1}(Z)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}\|) d\|V\|(X) \end{aligned}$$

where $T_Z : \mathbf{R}^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ is the translation $X \mapsto X - Z$.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(c)} \quad & \sum_{j=1}^{m_0} \sum_{\ell=1}^{q_j^{(0)}} \int_{B_{1/4}^{n+1}(Z) \cap H_{j,\ell} \setminus \{r(X) < \tau\}} \frac{|u_{j,\ell}(X) - (\zeta^1, \zeta^2, 0)^{\perp_{H_{j,\ell}}}|^2}{|X + u_{j,\ell}(X) - Z|^{n+2-\mu}} dX \\ & \leq C_1 \int_{B_1^{n+1}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}\|) d\|V\|(X). \end{aligned}$$

Here $C = C(n, \alpha, \gamma, \mathbf{C}_0) \in (0, \infty)$ and $C_1 = C_1(n, \alpha, \gamma, \mu, \mathbf{C}_0) \in (0, \infty)$. (In particular, C, C_1 do not depend on τ, ρ .)

Proof. The proof requires application of Theorem 16.2 with $\eta_{Z,\rho\#} V$ in place of V , where $Z \in \text{spt } \|V\| \cap B_{3/8}^{n+1}(0)$ is any point such that $\Theta(\|V\|, Z) \geq \Theta(\|\mathbf{C}_0\|, 0)$. It is straightforward to verify, using Remark (1) following the statement of Hypotheses 16.2 and the fact that $\|V\|(B_1^{n+1}(0) \cap \{X : r(X) < \delta\}) \leq C\sqrt{\delta}$, $C = C(n, q) \in (0, \infty)$, that whenever Hypotheses 16.2 are satisfied with $\epsilon = \epsilon(n, q, \alpha, \tau, \rho, \mathbf{C}_0)$ sufficiently small, they are also satisfied with $\eta_{Z,\rho\#} V$ in place of V and ϵ_0 (as in Theorem 16.2) in place of ϵ ; to verify that Hypothesis $(\dagger)$ is satisfied with $\eta_{Z,\rho\#} V$ in place of V and β_0 (as in Theorem 16.2) in place of β , we may follow the inductive argument of the corresponding part of Theorem 10.2.

The proof is then completed by the corresponding argument of [Sim93], with modifications as in [Wic04]. $\square$

Case $\Theta(\|\mathbf{C}_0\|, 0) = q + 1/2$:

From now on until we state otherwise, we shall assume that $\Theta(\|\mathbf{C}_0\|, 0) = q + 1/2$.

Lemma 16.4. *Let q be an integer ≥ 2 , $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, $\delta \in (0, 1/8)$, $\gamma \in (0, 1/2)$ and $\mathbf{C}_0$ be as above. Suppose that the induction hypotheses (H1), (H2) hold and that $\Theta(\|\mathbf{C}_0\|, 0) = q + 1/2$. There exist*

numbers $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_1(n, \alpha, \gamma, \delta, \mathbf{C}_0) \in (0, 1/2)$ and $\beta_1 = \beta_1(n, \alpha, \gamma, \mathbf{C}_0) \in (0, 1/2)$ such that if $V \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$, $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{K}$ satisfy Hypotheses 16.2 with ϵ_1 in place of ϵ then

(a) $B_\delta^{n+1}(0, y) \cap \{Z : \Theta(\|V\|, Z) \geq q + 1/2\} \neq \emptyset$ for each point $(0, y) \in \{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1} \cap B_{1/2}^{n+1}(0)$, and

(b) if additionally Hypothesis $(\dagger)$ holds with β_1 in place of β and $\mu \in (0, 1)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_{1/2}^{n+1}(0) \cap \{r(X) < \sigma\}} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}\|) d\|V\|(X) \\ \leq C_1 \sigma^{1-\mu} \int_{B_1^{n+1}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}\|) d\|V\|(X) \end{aligned}$$

for each $\sigma \in [\delta, 1/4)$, where $C_1 = C_1(n, q, \alpha, \mu, \mathbf{C}_0) \in (0, \infty)$. (In particular C_1 is independent of δ and σ .)

Proof. Suppose for some number $\delta \in (0, 1/8)$ and some point $(0, y) \in \{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1} \cap B_{1/2}^{n+1}(0)$, $B_\delta^{n+1}(0, y) \cap \{Z : \Theta(\|V\|, Z) \geq q + 1/2\} = \emptyset$. Then by Remark (2) following Hypotheses 16.2, it follows that

$$(16.7) \quad \mathcal{H}^{n-7+\gamma}(\text{sing } V \llcorner (B_\delta^{n+1}(0, y))) = 0 \text{ if } n \geq 7 \text{ and } \text{sing } V \llcorner (B_\delta^{n+1}(0, y)) = \emptyset \text{ if } 2 \leq n \leq 6.$$

Note that by $(\mathcal{S}2)$,

$$\int_{\text{reg } V} |A|^2 \zeta^2 d\mathcal{H}^n \leq \int_{\text{reg } V} |\nabla^V \zeta|^2 d\mathcal{H}^n$$

for any $\zeta \in C_c^1(\text{reg } V)$, where A denotes the second fundamental form of $\text{reg } V$. In view of (16.7), this is readily seen to imply, by an elementary covering argument (for the case $n \geq 7$), that

$$\int_{\text{spt } \|V\| \cap B_\delta^{n+1}(0, y)} |A|^2 \zeta^2 d\mathcal{H}^n \leq \int_{\text{spt } \|V\| \cap B_\delta^{n+1}(0, y)} |\nabla^V \zeta|^2 d\mathcal{H}^n$$

for any $\zeta \in C_c^1(B_\delta^{n+1}(0, y))$. Choosing $\zeta \in C_c^1(B_\delta^{n+1}(0, y))$ such that $\zeta \equiv 1$ in $B_{\delta/2}^{n+1}(0, y)$ and $|D\zeta| \leq 4\delta^{-1}$, we deduce from the preceding inequality that

$$(16.8) \quad \int_{\text{spt } \|V\| \cap B_{\delta/2}^{n+1}(0, y)} |A|^2 d\mathcal{H}^n \leq C\delta^{n-2}$$

where $C = C(n, q) \in (0, \infty)$.

Now let $\tau \in (0, \delta/4)$ be arbitrary for the moment and assume that $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0)$, where $\epsilon_0 = \epsilon_0(\alpha, \beta, \tau, \mathbf{C}_0)$ is as in Theorem 16.2. Using Theorem 16.2 (a), (16.8) and the argument leading to the inequality (6.12) of [SS81] (with $\sigma = \tau$), we deduce, provided $\epsilon = \epsilon(\alpha, \beta, \tau, \mathbf{C}_0)$ is sufficiently small and positive, that

$$C \leq \tau^{1/2} \delta^{-1/2},$$

where $C = C(\beta, \mathbf{C}_0) \in (0, \infty)$. This however is a contradiction if we choose e.g. $\tau = C^2 \delta^2$. We conclude that part (a) must hold provided $\epsilon = \epsilon(\alpha, \beta, \delta, \mathbf{C}_0) \in (0, 1/2)$ is sufficiently small.

To prove the estimate of part (b), first note that in view of Corollary 16.3 (a),(b) (with $\tau = 1/16$, say), it follows from the argument leading to the estimate (3) of [Sim93], p.619 that for each $Z \in \text{spt } \|V\| \cap B_{3/8}^{n+1}(0)$ with $\Theta(\|V\|, Z) \geq q$,

$$\int_{B_{1/4}^{n+1}(Z)} \frac{\text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}\|)}{|X - Z|^{n-\alpha}} d\|V\|(X) \leq C \int_{B_1^{n+1}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}\|) d\|V\|(X)$$

where $C = C(\beta, \alpha, \mathbf{C}_0) \in (0, \infty)$. By the argument of [Sim93], Corollary 3.2 (ii) (cf. proof of Lemma 10.3, (b)), the required estimate follows from this and part (a). $\square$

Let $\gamma \in (0, 1/2)$ and consider a sequence of varifolds $\{V_k\} \subset \mathcal{S}_\alpha$ and a sequence of cones $\{\mathbf{C}_k\}$ satisfying, for each $k = 1, 2, \dots$, Hypotheses 16.2 and Hypothesis (†) with $V_k, \mathbf{C}_k$ in place of $V, \mathbf{C}$ and ϵ_k, β_k in place of ϵ, β_k , where $\epsilon_k, \beta_k \rightarrow 0^+$. Thus, we suppose, for each $k = 1, 2, \dots$,

- (1_k) $V_k \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$, $0 \in \text{spt } \|V_k\|$, $\Theta(\|V_k\|, 0) \geq q + 1/2$, $(\omega_n 2^n)^{-1} \|V_k\|(B_2^{n+1}(0)) < q + 1/2 + \gamma$;
- (2_k) $\mathbf{C}_k = \sum_{j=1}^{m_0} \sum_{\ell=1}^{q_j^{(0)}} |H_{j,\ell}^k| \in \mathcal{K}$, where $H_{j,\ell}^k$ are half-hyperplanes of $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ meeting along $\{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1}$ with $H_{j,\ell}^k \in N(H_j^{(0)})$ for each $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, m_0\}$ and $\ell \in \{1, 2, \dots, q_j^{(0)}\}$;
- (3_k) $\text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}_k\| \cap B_1^{n+1}(0), \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}_0\| \cap B_1^{n+1}(0)) < \epsilon_k$;
- (4_k)

$$\int_{B_1^{n+1}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}_k\|) d\|V_k\|(X) < \epsilon_k;$$

- (5_k) For each $j = 1, 2, \dots, m_0$,

$$\|V_k\|((B_{1/2}^{n+1}(0) \setminus \{r(X) < 1/8\}) \cap N(H_j^{(0)})) \geq \mathcal{H}^n((B_{1/2}^{n+1}(0) \setminus \{r(X) < 1/8\}) \cap H_j^{(0)}) q_j^{(0)};$$

- (6_k) Either (i) or (ii) below holds:

- (i) $\mathbf{C}_k \in \mathcal{K}(m_0)$;
- (ii) $2q \geq m_0 + 1$, $\mathbf{C}_k \in \mathcal{K}(p_k)$ for some $p_k \in \{m_0 + 1, m_0 + 2, \dots, 2q\}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B_1^{n+1}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}_k\|) d\|V_k\|(X) + \int_{B_1^{n+1}(0) \setminus \{r(X) < 1/16\}} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|V_k\|) d\|\mathbf{C}_k\|(X) \\ & \leq \beta_k \inf_{\tilde{\mathbf{C}} \in \cup_{j=m_0}^{p-1} \mathcal{K}(j)} \left(\int_{B_1^{n+1}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\tilde{\mathbf{C}}\|) d\|V_k\|(X) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \int_{B_1^{n+1}(0) \setminus \{r(X) < 1/16\}} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|V_k\|) d\|\tilde{\mathbf{C}}\|(X) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Note that it follows from (2_k) and (3_k) that $H_{j,\ell}^k \rightarrow H_j^{(0)}$ for each $j \in \{1, \dots, m_0\}$ and $\ell \in \{1, \dots, q_j^{(0)}\}$.

$$\text{Let } \mathcal{E}_k = \sqrt{\int_{B_1^{n+1}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}_k\|) d\|V_k\|(X)}.$$

Let $\{\delta_k\}, \{\tau_k\}$ be sequences of decreasing positive numbers converging to 0. By passing to appropriate subsequences of $\{V_k\}, \{\mathbf{C}_k\}$ without changing notation, we have the following:

- (A_k) By Lemma 16.4,

$$(16.9) \quad B_{\delta_k}^{n+1}(0, y) \cap \{Z : \Theta(\|V_k\|, Z) \geq q + 1/2\} \neq \emptyset$$

for each point $(0, y) \in \{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1} \cap B_{1/2}^{n+1}(0)$ and

$$(16.10) \quad \int_{B_{1/2}^{n+1}(0) \cap \{r(X) < \sigma\}} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}_k\|) d\|V_k\|(X) \leq C \sigma^{1/2} \mathcal{E}_k^2$$

for each $\sigma \in [\delta_k, 1/4]$, where $C = C(n, q, \alpha, \gamma, \mathbf{C}_0) \in (0, \infty)$.

(B_k) By Theorem 16.2 (a),

$$(16.11) \quad V_k \llcorner (B_{7/8}^{n+1}(0) \setminus \{r(X) < \tau_k\}) = \sum_{j=1}^{m_0} \sum_{\ell=1}^{q_j^{(0)}} |\text{graph } u_{j,\ell}^k|$$

where, for each $k = 1, 2, \dots$, $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, m_0\}$ and $\ell \in \{1, 2, \dots, q_j^{(0)}\}$, $u_{j,\ell}^k \in C^2(B_{7/8}^{n+1}(0) \cap H_{j,\ell}^k \setminus \{r(X) < \tau_k\}; (H_{j,\ell}^k)^\perp)$, $u_{j,\ell}^k$ solves the minimal surface equation on $B_{7/8}^{n+1}(0) \cap H_{j,\ell}^k \setminus \{r(X) < \tau_k\}$ and satisfies $\text{dist}(X + u_{j,\ell}^k(X), \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}\|) = |u_{j,\ell}^k(X)|$ for $X \in B_{7/8}^{n+1}(0) \cap H_{j,\ell}^k \setminus \{r(X) < \tau_k\}$.

(C_k) For each point $Z = (\zeta^1, \zeta^2, \eta) \in \text{spt } \|V_k\| \cap B_{3/8}^{n+1}(0)$ with $\Theta(\|V_k\|, Z) \geq q + 1/2$, by Theorem 16.2 (d),

$$(16.12) \quad |\zeta^1|^2 + |\zeta^2|^2 \leq C\mathcal{E}_k^2$$

where $C = C(n, q, \alpha, \gamma, \mathbf{C}_0) \in (0, \infty)$.

(D_k) For each fixed $\mu \in (0, 1)$, $\rho \in (0, 1/4)$, each sufficiently large k and each point $Z = (\zeta^1, \zeta^2, \eta) \in \text{spt } \|V_k\| \cap B_{3/8}^{n+1}(0)$ with $\Theta(\|V_k\|, Z) \geq q + 1/2$, by Theorem 16.3 (c),

$$(16.13) \quad \sum_{j=1}^{m_0} \sum_{\ell=1}^{q_j^{(0)}} \int_{B_{1/4}^{n+1}(Z) \cap H_{j,\ell}^k \setminus \{r(X) < \tau_k\}} \frac{|u_{j,\ell}^k(X) - (\zeta^1, \zeta^2, 0)^\perp_{H_j^k}|^2}{|X + u_{j,\ell}^k(X) - Z|^{n+2-\mu}} dX \\ \leq C_1 \rho^{-n-2+\mu} \int_{B_\rho^{n+1}(Z)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}_k\|) d\|V_k\|(X),$$

where $C_1 = C_1(\alpha, \gamma, \mu, \mathbf{C}_0) \in (0, \infty)$.

Extend $u_{j,\ell}^k$ to all of $B_{7/8}^{n+1}(0) \cap H_{j,\ell}^k$ by defining values to be zero in $B_{7/8}^{n+1}(0) \cap H_{j,\ell}^k \cap \{r(X) < \tau_k\}$. For each $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, m_0\}$ and $\ell \in \{1, 2, \dots, q_j^{(0)}\}$, let $h_{j,\ell} : H_j^{(0)} \rightarrow (H_j^{(0)})^\perp$ be the linear functions such that $\{X + h_{j,\ell}(X) : X \in H_j^{(0)}\} = H_{j,\ell}$ and let $\tilde{u}_{j,\ell}^k(X) = u_{j,\ell}^k(X + h_{j,\ell}(X))$.

By (16.11) and elliptic estimates, there exist, for each $j = 1, 2, \dots, m_0$ and $\ell = 1, 2, \dots, q_j^{(0)}$ (for any manner in which the labeling is chosen for the elements of the sets

$$\{u_{j,1}^k, u_{j,2}^k, \dots, u_{j,q_j^{(0)}}^k\}, \quad k = 1, 2, 3, \dots)$$

harmonic functions $v_{j,\ell} : B_{3/4} \cap H_j^{(0)} \rightarrow (H_j^{(0)})^\perp$ such that, after passing to a subsequence,

$$(16.14) \quad \mathcal{E}_k^{-1} \tilde{u}_{j,\ell}^k \rightarrow v_{j,\ell}$$

where the convergence is in $C^2(K)$ for each compact subset K of $B_{3/4} \cap H_j^{(0)}$. From (16.10), it follows that for each $\sigma \in (0, 1/4)$,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{m_0} \sum_{\ell=1}^{q_j^{(0)}} \int_{B_{3/4}^{n+1}(0) \cap H_j^{(0)} \cap \{r(X) < \sigma\}} |v_{j,\ell}|^2 \leq C\sigma^{1/2}, \quad C = C(\alpha, \gamma, \mathbf{C}_0)$$

and hence that the convergence in (16.14) is also in $L^2(B_{3/4} \cap H_j^{(0)})$.

Lemma 16.5. *For each $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, m_0\}$ and $\ell \in \{1, 2, \dots, q_j^{(0)}\}$, we have that*

$$v_{j,\ell} \in C^{0,\mu} \left(\overline{B_{5/16}^{n+1}(0) \cap H_j^{(0)}}; (H_j^{(0)})^\perp \right)$$

with the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\sup}{B_{5/16}^{n+1}(0) \cap H_j^{(0)}} |v_{j,\ell}|^2 + \frac{\sup}{X_1, X_2 \in B_{5/16}^{n+1}(0) \cap H_j^{(0)}, X_1 \neq X_2} \frac{|v_{j,\ell}(X_1) - v_{j,\ell}(X_2)|^2}{|X_1 - X_2|^{2\mu}} \\ & \leq C \sum_{j=1}^{m_0} \sum_{\ell=1}^{q_j^{(0)}} \int_{B_{3/4}^{n+1}(0) \cap H_j^{(0)}} |v_{j,\ell}|^2 \end{aligned}$$

where $\mu = \mu(n, q, \alpha, \gamma, \mathbf{C}_0) \in (0, 1)$ and $C = C(n, q, \alpha, \gamma, \mathbf{C}_0) \in (0, \infty)$.

Proof. Note first that for each given $Y \in B_{5/16}^{n+1}(0) \cap \{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1}$, there exists, by (16.9), a sequence of points $Z_k = (\zeta_1^k, \zeta_2^k, \eta_k) \in \text{spt } \|V_k\| \cap B_{3/4}^{n+1}(0)$ with $\Theta(\|V_k\|, Z_k) \geq q$ such that $Z_k \rightarrow Y$. Passing to a subsequence without changing notation, the limits $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_k^{-1} \zeta_1^k$ and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_k^{-1} \zeta_2^k$ exist by (16.12). Write

$$(16.15) \quad \kappa(Y) = \left(\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_k^{-1} \zeta_1^k, \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_k^{-1} \zeta_2^k, 0 \right).$$

It follows from (16.13) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j=1}^{m_0} \sum_{\ell=1}^{q_j^{(0)}} \int_{B_{1/4}^{n+1}(Y) \cap H_j^{(0)}} \frac{|v_{j,\ell}(X) - \kappa(Y)^{\perp_{H_j^{(0)}}}|^2}{|X - Y|^{n+2-\mu}} dX \\ (16.16) \quad & \leq C_1 \rho^{-n-2+\mu} \sum_{j=1}^{m_0} \sum_{\ell=1}^{q_j^{(0)}} \int_{B_{\rho}^{n+1}(Y) \cap H_j^{(0)}} |v_{j,\ell}|^2 \end{aligned}$$

for each $\mu \in (0, 1)$, where $C_1 = C_1(\alpha, \gamma, \mu, \mathbf{C}_0) \in (0, \infty)$. This in particular implies that for each $j = 1, 2, \dots, m_0$, $\kappa(Y)^{\perp_{H_j^{(0)}}}$ is uniquely defined (depending only on Y and independent of the sequence $\{Z_k\}$ tending to Y), and hence, since the set of normal directions to $H_j^{(0)}$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, m_0$, spans $\mathbf{R}^2 \times \{0\}$, the vector $\kappa(Y)$ is also uniquely defined.

For $Y \in B_{1/4}^{n+1}(0) \cap \{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1}$, $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, m_0\}$ and $\ell \in \{1, 2, \dots, q_j^{(0)}\}$, define $v_{j,\ell}(Y) = \kappa(Y)^{\perp_{H_j^{(0)}}}$. The proof of the lemma can now be completed by modifying the proof of Lemma 12.1 in an obvious way. $\square$

Theorem 16.6. *For each $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, m_0\}$, $\ell \in \{1, 2, \dots, q_j^{(0)}\}$, we have that*

$$v_{j,\ell} \in C^2 \left(\overline{B_{1/4}^{n+1}(0) \cap H_j^{(0)}}; \left(H_j^{(0)} \right)^{\perp} \right)$$

with the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\sup}{B_{1/4}^{n+1}(0) \cap H_j^{(0)}} |Dv_{j,\ell}|^2 + \frac{\sup}{X_1, X_2 \in B_{1/4}^{n+1}(0) \cap H_j^{(0)}, X_1 \neq X_2} \frac{|Dv_{j,\ell}(X_1) - Dv_{j,\ell}(X_2)|^2}{|X_1 - X_2|^2} \\ & \leq C \sum_{j=1}^{m_0} \sum_{\ell=1}^{q_j^{(0)}} \int_{B_{3/4}^{n+1}(0) \cap H_j^{(0)}} |v_{j,\ell}|^2 \end{aligned}$$

where $C = C(n, q, \alpha, \gamma, \mathbf{C}_0) \in (0, \infty)$.

Proof. For $Y \in B_{1/2}^{n+1}(0) \cap \{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1}$, let

$$\tilde{\kappa}(Y) = \sum_{j=1}^{m_0} \kappa(Y)^{\perp_{H_j^{(0)}}}.$$

where κ is the function defined by (16.15). By modifying the argument leading to the estimate (12.31) in obvious ways, it can be seen that $\tilde{\kappa} \in C^2(B_{1/2}^{n+1}(0) \cap \{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1}; \mathbf{R}^{n+1})$ with

$$\sup_{B_{1/2}^{n+1}(0) \cap \{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1}} |\tilde{\kappa}|^2 + |D_Y \tilde{\kappa}|^2 + |D_Y^2 \tilde{\kappa}|^2 \leq C \sum_{j=1}^{m_0} \sum_{\ell=1}^{q_j^{(0)}} \int_{B_{3/4}^{n+1}(0) \cap H_j^{(0)}} |v_{j,\ell}|^2$$

where $C = C(\alpha, \gamma, \mathbf{C}_0) \in (0, \infty)$. Since the set of normal directions to $H_j^{(0)}$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, m_0$, span $\mathbf{R}^2 \times \{0\}$, it follows that for each $j = 1, 2, \dots, m_0$, $\kappa^{\perp_{H_j^{(0)}}} \in C^2(B_{1/2}^{n+1}(0) \cap \{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1}; \mathbf{R}^{n+1})$ with

$$(16.17) \quad \sup_{B_{1/2}^{n+1}(0) \cap \{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1}} |\kappa^{\perp_{H_j^{(0)}}}|^2 + |D_Y \kappa^{\perp_{H_j^{(0)}}}|^2 + |D_Y^2 \kappa^{\perp_{H_j^{(0)}}}|^2 \leq C \sum_{j=1}^{m_0} \sum_{\ell=1}^{q_j^{(0)}} \int_{B_{3/4}^{n+1}(0) \cap H_j^{(0)}} |v_{j,\ell}|^2$$

where $C = C(\alpha, \gamma, \mathbf{C}_0) \in (0, \infty)$. Since by Lemma 16.5, for each $j = 1, 2, \dots, m_0$ and $\ell = 1, 2, \dots, q_j^{(0)}$, $v_{j,\ell}$ is continuous in $\overline{B_{1/2}^{n+1}(0) \cap H_j^{(0)}}$ with boundary values $v_{j,\ell}|_{B_{1/2}^{n+1}(0) \cap \{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1}} \equiv \kappa^{\perp_{H_j^{(0)}}}$, and $v_{j,\ell}$ is harmonic in $B_{3/4}^{n+1}(0) \cap H_j^{(0)}$, the desired conclusions of the lemma follow, in view of the estimate (16.17), from the standard $C^{1,\alpha}$ boundary regularity theory for harmonic functions. $\square$

Lemma 16.7. *Let q be an integer ≥ 2 , $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, $\gamma \in (0, 1/2)$ and $\theta \in (0, 1/4)$. Let $\mathbf{C}_0$ be the stationary cone as in (16.2), with $\Theta(\|\mathbf{C}_0\|, 0) = q + 1/2$. There exist numbers $\bar{\epsilon} = \bar{\epsilon}(\alpha, \gamma, \theta, \mathbf{C}_0) \in (0, 1/2)$ and $\bar{\beta} = \bar{\beta}(\alpha, \gamma, \theta, \mathbf{C}_0) \in (0, 1/2)$ such that if $V \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$, $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{K}$ satisfy Hypotheses 16.2 and Hypothesis $(\dagger)$ with $\epsilon = \bar{\epsilon}$ and $\beta = \bar{\beta}$ and if the induction hypotheses (H1), (H2) hold, then there exist an orthogonal rotation Γ of $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ and a cone $\mathbf{C}' \in \mathcal{K}$ such that, with*

$$\mathcal{E}_V^2 = \int_{B_1^{n+1}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}\|) d\|V\|(X),$$

the following hold:

- (a) $|e_j - \Gamma(e_j)| \leq \bar{\kappa} \mathcal{E}_V$, for $j = 1, 2, 3, \dots, n+1$;
- (b) $\text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}^2(\text{spt } \|\Gamma_{\#} \mathbf{C}'\| \cap B_1^{n+1}(0), \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}\| \cap B_1^{n+1}(0)) \leq \bar{C}_0 \mathcal{E}_V^2$;
- (c) $\theta^{-n-2} \int_{\Gamma(B_\theta^{n+1}(0) \setminus \{r(X) \leq \theta/16\})} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|V\|) d\|\Gamma_{\#} \mathbf{C}'\|(X) + \theta^{-n-2} \int_{B_\theta^{n+1}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\Gamma_{\#} \mathbf{C}'\|) d\|V\|(X) \leq \bar{\nu} \theta^2 \mathcal{E}_V^2$.

Here the constants $\bar{\kappa}, \bar{C}_0, \bar{\nu} \in (0, \infty)$ each depends only on α, γ and $\mathbf{C}_0$.

Proof. If the lemma is false, there exist a sequence of varifolds $\{V_k\} \subset \mathcal{S}_\alpha$ and a sequence of cones $\{\mathbf{C}_k\} \subset \mathcal{K}$ satisfying, for each $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$, the conditions (1_k)–(6_k) above, listed immediately following the proof of Lemma 16.4.

Choose any two sequences of decreasing positive numbers $\{\delta_k\}$ and $\{\tau_k\}$ with $\delta_k \rightarrow 0$ and $\tau_k \rightarrow 0$ and corresponding subsequences of $\{V_k\}$, $\{\mathbf{C}_k\}$ for which the assertions (16.9)–(16.13) are

valid, and let $\{v_{j,\ell}\}_{j=1,2,\dots,m_0; \ell=1,2,\dots,q_j^{(0)}}$ be the blow-up of $\{V_k\}$ relative to $\{\mathbf{C}_k\}$. Thus, for each $j = 1, 2, \dots, m_0$ and $\ell = 1, 2, \dots, q_j^{(0)}$,

$$v_{j,\ell} \in L^2 \left(B_{3/4}^{n+1}(0) \cap H_j^{(0)}; \left(H_j^{(0)} \right)^\perp \right) \cap C^2 \left(B_{3/4}^{n+1}(0) \cap H_j^{(0)}; \left(H_j^{(0)} \right)^\perp \right)$$

are the functions produced as in (16.14).

Note then that Theorem 16.6 is applicable to the functions $v_{j,\ell}$. By following exactly the corresponding steps in the proof of Lemma 13.1, and using Theorem 16.6 where the proof of Lemma 13.1 depended on Theorem 12.2, we see that corresponding to infinitely many k , there are orthogonal rotations Γ_k , cones $\mathbf{C}'_k \in \mathcal{K}$ such that the conclusions of the present lemma hold with V_k , $\mathbf{C}_k$, $\mathbf{C}'_k$ and Γ_k in place of V , $\mathbf{C}$, $\mathbf{C}'$ and Γ , and with constants $\bar{\kappa}$, $\bar{\mathbf{C}}_0$, $\bar{\nu}$ depending only on α , γ and $\mathbf{C}_0$. This contradicts our assumption, establishing the lemma. $\square$

Lemma 16.8. *Let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, q an integer ≥ 2 and $\gamma \in (0, 1/2)$. Let $\mathbf{C}_0 = \sum_{j=1}^{m_0} \sum_{\ell=1}^{q_j^{(0)}} |H_{j,\ell}|$ be the stationary cone as in (16.2) with $\Theta(\|\mathbf{C}_0\|, 0) = q + 1/2$. For $j = 1, 2, \dots, 2q - m_0 + 1$, let $\theta_j \in (0, 1/4)$ be such that $\theta_1 > 8\theta_2 > 64\theta_3 > \dots > 8^{2q-m_0}\theta_{2q-m_0+1}$. There exists a number $\epsilon = \epsilon(\alpha, \gamma, \theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_{2q-m_0+1}, \mathbf{C}_0) \in (0, 1/2)$ such that the following is true: Let $V \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$, $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{K}$ satisfy Hypotheses 16.2 and suppose that the induction hypotheses (H1), (H2) hold. Then there exists an orthogonal rotation Γ of $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ and a cone $\mathbf{C}' \in \mathcal{K}$ such that, with*

$$\mathcal{Q}_V^2 = \int_{B_1^{n+1}(0) \setminus \{r(X) < 1/16\}} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|V\|) d\|\mathbf{C}\|(X) + \int_{B_1^{n+1}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}\|) d\|V\|(X),$$

we have the following:

- (a) $|e_j - \Gamma(e_j)| \leq \kappa \mathcal{Q}_V$, for $j = 1, 2, 3, \dots, n+1$;
- (b) $\text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}^2(\text{spt } \|\Gamma_\# \mathbf{C}'\| \cap B_1^{n+1}(0), \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}\| \cap B_1^{n+1}(0)) \leq C_0 \mathcal{Q}_V^2$, and
- (c) for some $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, 2q - m_0 + 1\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \theta_j^{-n-2} \int_{\Gamma(B_{\theta_j}^{n+1}(0) \setminus \{r(X) \leq \theta_j/16\})} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|V\|) d\|\Gamma_\# \mathbf{C}'\|(X) \\ & + \theta_j^{-n-2} \int_{B_{\theta_j}^{n+1}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\Gamma_\# \mathbf{C}'\|) d\|V\|(X) \leq \nu_j \theta_j^2 \mathcal{Q}_V^2. \end{aligned}$$

Here κ , C_0 depend only on $\alpha, \gamma, \mathbf{C}_0$ in case $2q = m_0$ and only on $\alpha, \gamma, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_{2q-m_0}$ and $\mathbf{C}_0$ in case $2q \geq m_0 + 1$; $\nu_1 = \nu_1(\alpha, \gamma, \mathbf{C}_0)$ and, in case $2q \geq m_0 + 1$, for each $j = 2, 3, \dots, p - m_0 + 1$, $\nu_j = \nu_j(\alpha, \gamma, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_{j-1}, \mathbf{C}_0)$. In particular, $\nu_j^{(p)}$ is independent of $\theta_j, \theta_{j+1}, \dots, \theta_{2q-m_0+1}$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, 2q - m_0 + 1$.

Proof. Use the argument of Lemma 13.2 and Lemma 13.3. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 16.1. Case 1: $\Theta(\|\mathbf{C}_0\|, 0) = q + 1/2$, $q \geq 2$.

If the theorem is false in this case, then there exist a number $\gamma \in (0, 1/2)$ and, for each $\ell = 1, 2, 3, \dots$, varifolds $V_\ell \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$ with $\Theta(\|V_\ell\|, 0) \geq q + 1/2$ and $(\omega_n 2^n)^{-1} \|V_\ell\|(B_2^{n+1}(0)) \leq q + 1/2 + \gamma$ such that $\text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\text{spt } \|V_\ell\| \cap B_1^{n+1}(0), \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}_0\| \cap B_1^{n+1}(0)) \rightarrow 0$. By Allard's integral varifold compactness theorem ([All72]; see also [Sim93], Section 42.8) and the constancy theorem ([Sim93], Section 41), it follows, after passing to a subsequence without changing notation, that $V_k \llcorner B_1^{n+1}(0) \rightarrow \left(\sum_{j=1}^{m_0} q_j^{(0)} |H_j^{(0)}| \right) \llcorner B_1^{n+1}(0)$ as varifolds, where $q_j^{(0)}$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, m_0$, are positive integers with

$\sum_{j=1}^{m_0} q_j^{(0)} = 2q + 1$. We may assume, by redefining the multiplicities of the original cone $\mathbf{C}_0$ if necessary, that $\mathbf{C}_0 = \sum_{j=1}^{m_0} q_j^{(0)} |H_j^{(0)}|$. Thus

$$(16.18) \quad V_\ell \llcorner B_1^{n+1}(0) \rightarrow \mathbf{C}_0 \llcorner B_1^{n+1}(0) \text{ as varifolds.}$$

For $j = 1, 2, \dots, 2q - m_0 + 2$, choose numbers $\theta_j = \theta_j(\alpha, \gamma, \mathbf{C}_0) \in (0, 1/2)$ as follows: First choose θ_1 such that $\nu_1 \theta_1^{2(1-\alpha)} < 1/4$, where $\nu_1 = \nu_1(\alpha, \gamma, \mathbf{C}_0)$ is as in Lemma 16.8. Having chosen $\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_j$, $1 \leq j \leq 2q - m_0$, choose θ_{j+1} such that $\theta_{j+1} < 8^{-1} \theta_j$ and $\nu_{j+1} \theta_{j+1}^{2(1-\alpha)} < 4^{-1}$, where $\nu_{j+1} = \nu_{j+1}(\alpha, \gamma, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_j, \mathbf{C}_0)$ is as in Lemma 16.8. Note that by (16.18), for all sufficiently large ℓ , the hypotheses of Lemma 16.8 with $\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_{2q-m_0+1}$ as just chosen, and with $\mathbf{C}_0$ in place of $\mathbf{C}$ and V_ℓ in place of V , are satisfied.

By arguing as in the proof of Lemma 14.1 (using Lemma 16.8 iteratively in the manner in which Lemma 13.3 was used in the proof of Lemma 14.1, and utilizing Theorem 16.2 in place of Theorem 10.1 and Corollary 10.2, and Lemma 16.4 in place of Lemma 10.3), we reach the conclusion that for any fixed sufficiently large ℓ and $V = V_\ell$, there exist a cone $\mathbf{C}^0 \in \mathcal{K}$ with

$$(16.19) \quad \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}^0\| \cap B_1^{n+1}(0), \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}_0\| \cap B_1^{n+1}(0)) \leq C \mathcal{Q}_V;$$

orthogonal rotations $\Gamma^0, \Gamma_0^0, \Gamma_1^0, \Gamma_2^0, \dots$ of $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ with $\Gamma_0^0 = \text{Identity}$ and, for each $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$,

$$(16.20) \quad |\Gamma^0(e_j) - \Gamma_k^0(e_j)| \leq C \delta_k \mathcal{Q}_V, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, n+1;$$

such that, for $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$,

$$(16.21) \quad \sigma_k^{-n-2} \int_{B_{\sigma_k}^{n+1}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\Gamma_k^0 \mathbf{C}^0\|) d\|V\|(X) \leq C \sigma_k^{2\alpha} \mathcal{Q}_V^2, \quad \text{and}$$

$$(16.22) \quad \sigma_k^{-n-2} \int_{\Gamma_k^0(B_{\sigma_k/2}^{n+1}(0) \setminus \{|r(X)| \leq \sigma_k/16\})} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|V\|) d\|\Gamma_k^0 \mathbf{C}^0\|(X) \leq C \sigma_k^{2\alpha} \mathcal{Q}_V^2$$

where $C = C(\alpha, \gamma, \mathbf{C}_0) \in (0, \infty)$ and $\{\sigma_k\}, \{\delta_k\}$ are sequences of positive numbers such that $\sigma_0 = 1$ and for each $k = 1, 2, \dots$, $\sigma_k = \theta_{j_k} \sigma_{k-1}$, $\delta_k = \nu_{j_k} \theta_{j_k}^2 \delta_{k-1}$ for some $j_k \in \{1, 2, \dots, 2q - m_0 + 1\}$.

By using the inequality (16.21) with k such that $\sigma_{k+1}/2 < \rho \leq \sigma_k/2$, we deduce that

$$(16.23) \quad \rho^{-n-2} \int_{B_\rho^{n+1}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\Gamma_k^0 \mathbf{C}^0\|) d\|V\|(X) \leq C \rho^{2\alpha} \mathcal{Q}_V^2,$$

for all $\rho \in (0, 1/2]$, where $C = C(\alpha, \gamma, \mathbf{C}_0) \in (0, \infty)$.

Now note that since $\gamma < 1/2$, we may use (16.18) and the induction hypothesis (H1) to conclude that for any given $\tau \in (0, 1/16)$, if the conclusion of the theorem fails with $\epsilon = \epsilon'$ where $\epsilon' = \epsilon'(\alpha, \gamma, \tau, \mathbf{C}_0) \in (0, 1/2)$ is sufficiently small, then

$$\{Z \in \text{spt } \|V\| : \Theta(\|V\|, Z) \geq q\} \cap B_{1/2}^{n+1}(0) \subset \{X \in \mathbf{R}^{n+1} : r(X) < \tau\} \quad \text{and}$$

$$V \llcorner \left(B_{7/8}^{n+1}(0) \setminus \{r(X) < \tau/2\} \right) = \sum_{j=1}^{m_0} \sum_{i=1}^{q_j^{(0)}} |\text{graph } \tilde{u}_{j,i}|,$$

where for each $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, m_0\}$ and $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, q_j^{(0)}\}$,

$$\tilde{u}_{j,i} \in C^2 \left(H_j^{(0)} \cap \left(B_{7/8}^{n+1}(0) \setminus \{r(X) < \tau/2\} \right); \left(H_j^{(0)} \right)^\perp \right)$$

and $\tilde{u}_{j,i}$ are solutions to the minimal surface equation over $H_j^{(0)} \cap (B_{7/8}^{n+1}(0) \setminus \{r(X) < \tau/2\})$ with small C^2 norm. Using this with sufficiently small $\tau = \tau(\alpha, \gamma, \mathbf{C}_0) \in (0, 1/16)$, it is standard to verify that if the conclusion of the theorem fails with $\epsilon = \epsilon'$, where $\epsilon' = \epsilon'(\alpha, \gamma, \mathbf{C}_0) \in (0, 1/4)$ is sufficiently small, and if $Z \in \text{spt } \|V\| \cap B_\sigma^{n+1}(0)$, $\Theta(\|V\|, Z) \geq q + 1/2$, where $\sigma = \sigma(\alpha, \gamma, \mathbf{C}_0) \in (0, 1/16)$ are sufficiently small, then the hypotheses of Lemma 16.8 will be satisfied with $\eta_{Z, 1/2\#} V$ in place of V and $\mathbf{C}_0$ in place of $\mathbf{C}$. Thus, repeating the argument leading to (16.19), (16.20) and (16.23), we see that if the conclusion of the theorem fails with $\epsilon = \epsilon'$, then corresponding to each $Z \in \text{spt } \|V\| \cap B_\sigma^{n+1}(0)$ with $\Theta(\|V\|, Z) \geq q + 1/2$, there exist a cone $\mathbf{C}^Z \in \mathcal{K}$ with

$$(16.24) \quad \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}^Z\| \cap B_1^{n+1}(0), \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}_0\| \cap B_1^{n+1}(0)) \leq C \mathcal{Q}_V;$$

orthogonal rotations $\Gamma^Z, \Gamma_0^Z, \Gamma_1^Z, \Gamma_2^Z, \dots$ of $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ with $\Gamma_0^Z = \text{Identity}$ and, for each $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$,

$$(16.25) \quad |\Gamma^Z(e_j) - \Gamma_k^Z(e_j)| \leq C \delta_k^Z \mathcal{Q}_V, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, n+1;$$

such that

$$(16.26) \quad (\sigma_k^Z)^{-n-2} \int_{\Gamma_k^Z(B_{\sigma_k^Z/2}^{n+1}(0) \setminus \{|r(X)| \leq \sigma_k^Z/16\})} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|V\|) d\|\Gamma_\#^Z \mathbf{C}^Z\|(X) \leq C (\sigma_k^Z)^{2\alpha} \mathcal{Q}_V^2 \quad \text{and}$$

$$(16.27) \quad \rho^{-n-2} \int_{B_\rho^{n+1}(Z)} \text{dist}^2(X, Z + \text{spt } \|\Gamma_\#^Z \mathbf{C}^Z\|) d\|V\|(X) \leq C \rho^{2\alpha} \mathcal{Q}_V^2,$$

for all $\rho \in (0, 1/4]$, where $C = C(\alpha, \gamma, \mathbf{C}_0) \in (0, \infty)$ and $\{\sigma_k^Z\}, \{\delta_k^Z\}$ are sequences of positive numbers such that $\sigma_0^Z = \delta_0^Z = 1$ and for each $k = 1, 2, \dots$, $\sigma_k^Z = \theta_{j_k^Z} \sigma_{k-1}^Z$, $\delta_k^Z = \nu_{j_k^Z} \theta_{j_k^Z}^2 \delta_{k-1}^Z$ for some $j_k^Z \in \{1, 2, \dots, 2q - m_0 + 2\}$.

Standard arguments then show that $T = \{Z : \Theta(\|V\|, Z) \geq q + 1/2\} \cap B_{\sigma/2}^{n+1}(0)$ is an $(n-1)$ -dimensional, embedded $C^{1,\alpha}$ submanifold of $B_{\sigma/2}^{n+1}(0)$ and that $V \llcorner B_{\sigma/2}^{n+1}(0) = \sum_{j=1}^{2q+1} |M_j|$ where, for each $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, 2q+1\}$, M_j is a $C^{1,\alpha}$ embedded hypersurface-with-boundary such that $\partial M_j \cap B_{\sigma/2}^{n+1}(0) = T$ and $M_j \cap M_k = T$ or $M_j = M_k$ for each $j, k \in \{1, 2, 3, \dots, 2q+1\}$. (Thus in particular, $T = \{Z : \Theta(\|V\|, Z) = q + 1/2\} \cap B_{\sigma/2}^{n+1}(0)$.) This contradicts the structural property (S3) that V is assumed to satisfy, completing the proof of the theorem.

Case 2: $\Theta(\|\mathbf{C}_0\|, 0) = q + 1, q \geq 2$.

Note that by the validity of Theorem 16.1 in case $\Theta(\|\mathbf{C}_0\|, 0) = q + 1/2$, it follows that the assertion of Remark (2) following Hypotheses 16.2 holds with $q + 1$ in place of $q + 1/2$. Thus we may simply repeat all of the steps of the above argument taking $q + 1$ in place of $q + 1/2$ to establish Theorem 16.1 in case $\Theta(\|\mathbf{C}_0\|, 0) = q + 1$.

This completes the proof of Theorem 16.1. $\square$

Remark: Theorem 3.2' in case $q = 1$ follows from Allard's regularity theorem. The validity of Theorem 3.3 in case $\Theta(\|\mathbf{C}_0\|, 0) = 3/2$ follows from the validity of Theorem 3.2' in case $q = 1$; indeed, in this case, the same argument as for Theorem 16.1 carries over (with obvious simplifications) provided the induction hypothesis (H1) is replaced by Theorem 3.2', case $q = 1$. In fact, when $\Theta(\|\mathbf{C}_0\|, 0) = 3/2$, Theorem 3.3 is true without either of the hypotheses (S2) or (S3) on V (so V only needs to be stationary); see [[Sim93], Corollaries 2 and 3]. This in turn enables us to prove Theorem 3.3 in case $\Theta(\|\mathbf{C}_0\|, 0) = 2$, by repeating the above proof of Theorem 16.1 (case $\Theta(\|\mathbf{C}_0\|, 0) = q + 1$), taking $q = 1$ and, in place of induction hypotheses (H1) and (H2), Theorem 3.2' (case $q = 1$) and Theorem 3.3 (case $\Theta(\|\mathbf{C}_0\|, 0) = 3/2$) respectively.

Theorems 15.2, 16.1 together with the preceding Remark complete the inductive proof of both Theorem 3.2' and Theorem 3.3.

17. THE REGULARITY AND COMPACTNESS THEOREM

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Note first that if $V \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$, then it follows from Theorem 3.2, Theorem 3.3 and Remark 3 of Section 7 that $\mathcal{H}^{n-7+\gamma}(\text{sing } V \cap (B_2^{n+1}(0))) = 0$ for each $\gamma > 0$ if $n \geq 7$ and $\text{sing } V \cap B_2^{n+1}(0) = \emptyset$ if $2 \leq n \leq 6$.

Suppose, for each $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$, $V_k \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$ and that

$$\Lambda = \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|V_k\|(B_2^{n+1}(0)) < \infty.$$

By Allard's integer varifold compactness theorem, there exists a stationary integral varifold V of $B_2^{n+1}(0)$, with $\|V\|(B_2^{n+1}(0)) < \Lambda + 1$, such that, after passing to a subsequence, $V_k \rightarrow V$ as varifolds in $B_2^{n+1}(0)$. Set $K = \text{sing } V \cap B_2^{n+1}(0)$.

We argue that $V \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$ as follows. By Theorem 3.2 and unique continuation of solutions to the minimal surface equation, if M is a connected component of $\text{reg } V$ and $0 < \rho' < \rho < 2$, there exists a number $\epsilon = \epsilon(M, \rho, \rho') \in (0, 1/2)$ such that for all sufficiently large k , $\text{spt } \|V_k\| \cap \{X \in B_\rho^{n+1}(0) : \text{dist}(X, M \cap B_{\rho'}^{n+1}(0)) < \epsilon\} \supset \cup_{j=1}^q \text{graph } u_j^k \supset \text{spt } \|V_k\| \cap \{X \in B_{\rho'}^{n+1}(0) : \text{dist}(X, M \cap B_{\rho'}^{n+1}(0)) < \epsilon\}$ for some integer $q \geq 1$ and functions $u_j^k \in C^{1,\alpha}(M \cap B_{\rho'}^{n+1}(0); M^\perp)$ solving the minimal surface equation on $M \cap B_{\rho'}^{n+1}(0)$. It follows that $\int_{\text{reg } V} |A|^2 \zeta^2 \leq \int_{\text{reg } V} |\nabla \zeta|^2$ for each $\zeta \in C_c^1(\text{reg } V)$, where A denotes the second fundamental form of $\text{reg } V$. It is also clear, from Theorem 3.3, that V satisfies the structural property $(\mathcal{S}3)$; for if not, there exists a point $Z \in \text{spt } \|V\| \cap B_2^{n+1}(0)$ such that the (unique) tangent cone $\mathbf{C}_Z$ to V at Z is supported by the union of a finite number (≥ 3) of half-hyperplanes meeting along an $(n-1)$ -dimensional subspace. By the definition of tangent cone and the fact that varifold convergence of stationary integral varifolds implies convergence in Hausdorff distance of the supports of the associated weight measures, for any given $\epsilon_1 > 0$, there exists a number $\sigma \in (0, \text{dist}(Z, \partial B_2^{n+1}(0)))$ such that for all sufficiently large k , $\text{dist}(\text{spt } \|\eta_{Z, \sigma} \# V_k\| \cap B_1^{n+1}(0), \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}_Z\| \cap B_1^{n+1}(0)) < \epsilon_1$. This however contradicts Theorem 3.3 if we take $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon(1/2, \mathbf{C}_Z)$, where ϵ is as in Theorem 3.3. Thus $V \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$, and hence $\mathcal{H}^{n-7+\gamma}(K) = 0$ for each $\gamma > 0$ if $n \geq 7$ and $K = \emptyset$ if $2 \leq n \leq 6$.

Finally, suppose $n = 7$ and consider any $V \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$. To complete the proof of the theorem, it only remains to show that K is discrete. If this were false, there would exist points $Z, Z_j \in K$, $j = 1, 2, 3, \dots$, such that $Z_j \neq Z$ for each $j = 1, 2, 3, \dots$ and $Z_j \rightarrow Z$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$. Letting $\sigma_j = |Z - Z_j|$, we obtain, passing to a subsequence without changing notation, a tangent cone $\mathbf{C} = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \eta_{Z, \sigma_j} \# V$. By the discussion above, $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$. Since $\sigma_j^{-1}(Z_j - Z) \in \mathbf{S}^{n-1} \cap \text{sing } \eta_{Z, \sigma_j} \# V$, it follows, passing to a further subsequence, that $\sigma_j^{-1}(Z_j - Z) \rightarrow Z^* \in \mathbf{S}^{n-1}$ and by Hausdorff convergence and Theorem 3.2, $Z^* \in \text{sing } \mathbf{C}$. Since $\mathbf{C}$ is a cone, it follows that $\{tZ^* : t > 0\} \subset \text{sing } \mathbf{C}$, which is impossible since $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$ and we have established that for $n = 7$, $\mathcal{H}^\gamma(K) = 0$ for each $\gamma > 0$ and any $V \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha$. $\square$

18. GENERALIZATION TO RIEMANNIAN MANIFOLDS

Let N be a smooth $(n+1)$ -dimensional Riemannian manifold (without boundary) and for $X \in N$, let $\exp_X$ denote the exponential map at X . For each $X \in N$, let $R_X \in (0, \infty]$ be the injectivity radius at X .

Let $\tilde{V}$ be a stationary integral n -varifold of N . Let $X_0 \in \text{spt } \|\tilde{V}\|$, $\mathcal{N}_{\rho_0}(X_0)$ be a normal coordinate ball of radius $\rho_0 \in (0, R_{X_0})$ around X_0 . Then $V = \exp_{X_0}^{-1} \tilde{V} \llcorner \mathcal{N}_{\rho_0}(X_0)$ is an integral n -varifold of $B_{\rho_0}^{n+1}(0) \subset T_{X_0} N \approx \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ which is stationary with respect to the functional

$$(18.1) \quad \mathcal{F}_{X_0}(V) = \int_{B_{\rho_0}^{n+1}(0) \times G_n} |\Lambda_n DF(X) \circ S| dV(X, S)$$

where $F \equiv \exp_{X_0}$. Let $\psi \in C_c^1(B_{\rho_0}^{n+1}(0); \mathbf{R}^{n+1})$ and let φ_t , $t \in (-\epsilon, \epsilon)$ be the flow generated by ψ . By computing directly the first variation $\delta_{\mathcal{F}_{X_0}} V(\psi) \equiv \frac{d}{dt} \big|_{t=0} \mathcal{F}_{X_0}(\varphi_t \# V)$ of V with respect to $\mathcal{F}_{X_0}$ and setting $\delta_{\mathcal{F}_{X_0}} V(\psi) = 0$, we see that the following bound holds (cf. [SS81] (1.7), (1.9) and (1.11)) for some constant μ depending only on the metric on N . (Such $\mu \in (0, \infty)$ exists by replacing N with a suitable open subset of N if necessary):

($\mathcal{S}^*1$)

$$\left| \int_{B_{\rho_0}^{n+1}(0) \times G_n} \text{div}_S \psi(X) dV(X, S) \right| \leq \mu \int_{B_{\rho_0}^{n+1}(0)} (|\psi(X)| + |X| |D\psi(X)|) d\|V\|(X)$$

for all $\psi \in C_c^1(B_{\rho_0}^{n+1}(0); \mathbf{R}^{n+1})$.

Furthermore, for $\psi \in C_c^1(B_{\rho_0}^{n+1}(0) \setminus \text{sing } V; \mathbf{R}^{n+1})$, the second variation

$$\delta_{\mathcal{F}_{X_0}}^2 V(\psi) \equiv \frac{d^2}{dt^2} \bigg|_{t=0} \mathcal{F}_{X_0}(\varphi_t \# V)$$

of V with respect to $\mathcal{F}_{X_0}$ is given by (cf. [SS81] (1.8), (1.10), (1.12))

$$\delta_{\mathcal{F}_{X_0}}^2 V(\psi) = \int_{\text{reg } V} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |(D_{\tau_i} \psi)^\perp|^2 + (\text{div}_{\text{reg } V} \psi)^2 - \sum_{i,j=1}^n (\tau_i \cdot D_{\tau_j} \psi) \cdot (\tau_j \cdot D_{\tau_i} \psi) \right) d\mathcal{H}^n + R(\psi)$$

where $\{\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_n\}$ is an orthonormal basis for the tangent space $T_X(\text{reg } V)$ of $\text{reg } V$ at X , $D_\tau \psi$ denotes the directional derivative of ψ in the direction τ and

$$|R(\psi)| \leq c\mu \int_{\text{reg } V} (\tilde{c}\mu |\psi|^2 + |\psi| |\nabla \psi| + |X| |\nabla \psi|^2) d\mathcal{H}^n$$

with $c, \tilde{c}$ absolute constants. If $\text{reg } V$ is orientable and ν is a continuous choice of unit normal to $\text{reg } V$, we may, for any $\zeta \in C_c^1(\text{reg } V)$, extend $\zeta\nu$ to a vector field in $C_c^1(B_{\rho_0}^{n+1}(0) \setminus \text{sing } V; \mathbf{R}^{n+1})$ and take in the above $\psi = \zeta\nu$ to deduce that (cf. [SS81] (1.14), (1.15))

$$\delta_{\mathcal{F}_{X_0}}^2 V(\psi) = \int_{\text{reg } V} (|\nabla \zeta|^2 - |A|^2 \zeta^2 + H^2 \zeta^2) d\mathcal{H}^n + R(\psi)$$

where A denotes the second fundamental form of $\text{reg } V$, $|A|$ the length of A , H the mean curvature of $\text{reg } V$ and

$$|R(\psi)| \leq c\mu \int_{\text{reg } V} (\tilde{c}\mu |\zeta|^2 + |\zeta| |\nabla \zeta| + \zeta^2 |A| |X| |\nabla \zeta|^2 + |X| \zeta^2 |A|^2) d\mathcal{H}^n.$$

If $\delta_{\mathcal{F}_{X_0}}^2 V(\psi) \geq 0$ for all $\psi = \zeta\nu$, $\zeta \in C_c^1(\text{reg } V)$, then we have (cf. [SS81] (1.17))

($\mathcal{S}^*2$)

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\text{reg } V \cap B_{\rho_0}^{n+1}(0)} |A|^2 \zeta^2 d\mathcal{H}^n &\leq \int_{\text{reg } V \cap B_{\rho_0}^{n+1}(0)} |\nabla \zeta|^2 d\mathcal{H}^n \\ &+ c_1 \mu \int_{\text{reg } V \cap B_{\rho_0}^{n+1}(0)} (c_2 \mu \zeta^2 + \zeta |\nabla \zeta| + \zeta^2 |A| + |X| |\nabla \zeta|^2 + |X| \zeta^2 |A|^2 + c_2 \mu |X|^2 \zeta^2 |A|^2) d\mathcal{H}^n \end{aligned}$$

for all $\zeta \in C_c^1(\text{reg } V)$ where c_1, c_2 are constants depending only on n .

For the rest of this discussion, we take μ, c_1, c_2 to be chosen as above and fixed.

Definitions: Let μ, c_1, c_2 be the positive numbers as above.

(1) By a *stable integral n -varifold $\tilde{V}$ on N* we mean a stationary integral n -varifold $\tilde{V}$ on N such that for each $X_0 \in \text{spt } \|\tilde{V}\|$ and each normal ball $\mathcal{N}_{\rho_0}(X_0) \subset N$ around X_0 , the integral n -varifold $V = (\exp_{X_0}^{-1})_{\#} \tilde{V} \llcorner \mathcal{N}_{\rho_0}(X_0)$ on $B_{\rho_0}^{n+1}(0) \subset \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ satisfies ($\mathcal{S}^*2$).

(2) For $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, let $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_\alpha$ denote the collection of stable integral n -varifolds on N satisfying the structural condition ($\mathcal{S}3$) of Section 3 taken with normal ball $\mathcal{N}_\rho(Z) \subset N$ in place of $B_\rho^{n+1}(Z)$.

(3) For $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, let $\mathcal{S}_\alpha^*$ denote the collection of integral n -varifolds V on $B_1^{n+1}(0) \subset \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ such that

$$(18.2) \quad V = \eta_{0,\rho} \# \exp_{X\#}^{-1} \tilde{V} \llcorner \mathcal{N}_\rho(X)$$

for some $\tilde{V} \in \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_\alpha$, $X \in \text{spt } \|\tilde{V}\|$ and $\rho \in (0, R_X)$.

(4) For $\rho \in (0, \infty)$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, let $\mathcal{S}_\alpha^*(\rho)$ be the set of integral n -varifolds $V \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha^*$ such that (18.2) holds for some $\tilde{V} \in \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_\alpha$ and $X \in \text{spt } \|\tilde{V}\|$ with $R_X \geq \rho$.

Remark: Let $\rho \in (0, \infty)$ and suppose that $V \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha^*(\rho)$. Then for each $Y \in \text{spt } \|V\| \cap B_{1/2}^{n+1}(0)$,

$$(18.3) \quad \eta_{0,\rho/2} \# \tau_Y \# V \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha^*(\rho/2)$$

where $\tau_Y = \exp_{\exp_X(\rho Y)}^{-1} \circ \exp_X \circ \eta_{0,\rho^{-1}}$. Note that $\tau_Y(Y) = 0$.

We assert that the following direct analog of Theorem 3.1 holds:

Theorem 18.1 (REGULARITY AND COMPACTNESS THEOREM—MANIFOLD VERSION). *Let N be a smooth $(n+1)$ -dimensional Riemannian manifold, $X_0 \in N$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$. Let $\{\tilde{V}_k\} \subset \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_\alpha$ be a sequence with $X_0 \in \text{spt } \|\tilde{V}_k\|$ for each $k = 1, 2, \dots$, and with*

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\tilde{V}_k\|(N) < \infty.$$

Then there exist a subsequence $\{k'\}$ of $\{k\}$ and a varifold $\tilde{V} \in \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_\alpha$ with $X_0 \in \text{spt } \|\tilde{V}\|$ and with $\mathcal{H}^{n-7+\gamma}(\text{sing } \tilde{V} \cap N) = 0$ for each $\gamma > 0$ if $n \geq 7$, $\text{sing } \tilde{V} \cap N$ discrete if $n = 7$ and $\text{sing } \tilde{V} \cap N = \emptyset$ if $2 \leq n \leq 6$ such that $\tilde{V}_{k'} \rightarrow \tilde{V}$ as varifolds of N and smoothly (i.e. in the C^m topology for every m) locally in $N \setminus \text{sing } \tilde{V}$.

In particular, if $\tilde{W} \in \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_\alpha$, then $\mathcal{H}^{n-7+\gamma}(\text{sing } \tilde{W} \cap N) = 0$ for each $\gamma > 0$ if $n \geq 7$, $\text{sing } \tilde{W} \cap N$ is discrete if $n = 7$ and $\text{sing } \tilde{W} \cap N = \emptyset$ if $2 \leq n \leq 6$.

By the preceding discussion, this theorem is equivalent to the assertion obtained from it by replacing N with $B_1^{n+1}(0) \subset \mathbf{R}^{n+1}$, X_0 with 0 and $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_\alpha$ with $\mathcal{S}_\alpha^*$; the proof of the latter amounts to making minor modifications, as described below, to the proof of Theorem 3.1.

Step 1: Let V be an integral n -varifold of $B_1^{n+1}(0)$ such that (18.2) holds for some stationary integral n -varifold $\tilde{V}$ of N , $X_0 \in \text{spt } \|\tilde{V}\|$ in place of X and $\rho_0 \in (0, R_{X_0})$ in place of ρ . By the discussion involving (5.3)–(5.9) of [SS81], we have, for each $0 < \sigma < \delta$, where $\delta = \delta(n, \mu\rho_0) \in (0, 1)$, the following facts:

$$(18.4) \quad \tau^{-n} \|V\|(B_\tau^{n+1}(0)) \leq (1 + 12n\mu\rho_0\sigma)\sigma^{-n} \|V\|(B_\sigma^{n+1}(0))$$

for all τ with $0 < \tau \leq \sigma$; the density $\Theta(\|V\|, 0) = \lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0} \frac{\|V\|(B_\tau^{n+1}(0))}{\omega_n \tau^n}$ exists (and is finite); the function $\Theta(\|\cdot\|, 0)$ is upper semi-continuous;

$$(18.5) \quad \int_{B_\sigma^{n+1}(0)} \frac{|X^\perp|^2}{|X|^{n+2}} d\|V\|(X) \leq \frac{\|V\|(B_\sigma^{n+1}(0))}{\omega_n \sigma^n} - \Theta(\|V\|, 0) + C\sigma \frac{\|V\|(B_\sigma^{n+1}(0))}{\omega_n \sigma^n}$$

where $C = C(n, \mu\rho_0) \in (0, \infty)$; tangent cones to V at $0 \in \text{spt } \|V\|$ exist and are stationary integral hypercones of $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$.

Let $\text{VarTan}(V, 0)$ denote the set of tangent cones to V at 0. For $Y \in \text{spt } \|V\| \cap B_{1/2}(0)$, let $\Theta(\|V\|, Y) = \Theta(\|\eta_{0, \rho_0/2} \# \tau_Y \# V\|, 0)$ (see 18.3) and $\text{VarTan}(V, Y) = \text{VarTan}(\eta_{0, \rho_0/2} \# \tau_Y \# V, 0)$. Recalling the well known fact that if $\mathbf{C}$ is a stationary cone in a Euclidean space $\mathbf{R}^m$, then the set $\{Z \in \mathbf{R}^m : \Theta(\|\mathbf{C}\|, Z) = \Theta(\|\mathbf{C}\|, 0)\}$ is a linear subspace of $\mathbf{R}^m$, we deduce by the argument of Almgren's generalized stratification of stationary integral varifolds ([Alm83], Remark 2.28; see also [Sim96], Section 3.4) the following:

Let V be an integral n -varifold of $B_1^{n+1}(0)$ such that (18.2) holds for some stationary integral n -varifold $\tilde{V}$ of N , $X \in \text{spt } \|\tilde{V}\|$ and $\rho \in (0, R_X)$. For $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, n$, let $S_k = \{Y \in \text{spt } \|V\| \cap B_{1/2}^{n+1}(0) : \dim \{Z \in \mathbf{R}^{n+1} : \Theta(\|\mathbf{C}\|, Z) = \Theta(\|\mathbf{C}\|, 0)\} \leq k \ \forall \mathbf{C} \in \text{VarTan}(V, Y)\}$. Then $\dim_{\mathcal{H}}(S_k) \leq k$.

Step 2: We claim that the following analogs of Theorems 3.2 and 3.3 hold.

Theorem 18.2 (SHEETING THEOREM—MANIFOLD VERSION). *Let $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$, $\rho_0 \in (0, \infty)$ and q be any integer ≥ 1 . Let $\alpha' = (2\alpha + 1)/4$. There exists a number $\epsilon_0 = \epsilon_0(n, q, \alpha, \mu\rho_0) \in (0, 1)$ such that if $V \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha^*(\rho_0)$, $\omega_n^{-1} \|V\|(B_1^{n+1}(0)) < q + 1/2$, $\sigma \in (0, 1/2)$, $(q - 1/2) \leq (\omega_n \sigma^n)^{-1} \|V\|(B_\sigma^{n+1}(0)) < (q + 1/2)$ and $\sigma^{-1} \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\text{spt } \|V\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_\sigma), \{0\} \times B_\sigma) + \sigma^{2\alpha'} < \epsilon_0$ then*

$$V \llcorner (\mathbf{R} \times B_{\sigma/2}) = \sum_{j=1}^q |\text{graph } u_j|$$

where $u_j \in C^{1, \beta}(B_{\sigma/2})$ for each $j = 1, 2, \dots, q$; $u_1 \leq u_2 \leq \dots \leq u_q$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma^{-1} \sup_{B_{\sigma/2}} |u_j| + \sup_{B_{\sigma/2}} |Du_j| + \sigma^\beta \sup_{X_1, X_2 \in B_{\sigma/2}, X_1 \neq X_2} \frac{|Du_j(X_1) - Du_j(X_2)|}{|X_1 - X_2|^\beta} \\ \leq C \left(\sigma^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_\sigma} |x^\perp|^2 d\|V\|(X) + \sigma^{2\alpha'} \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Here $C = C(n, q, \alpha, \mu\rho_0) \in (0, \infty)$ and $\beta = \beta(n, q, \alpha, \mu\rho_0) \in (0, 1)$.

Remark: If the conclusions of Theorem 18.2 hold, and V corresponds, as in (18.2), to some $\tilde{V} \in \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_\alpha$, $X = X_0 \in N \cap \text{spt } \|\tilde{V}\|$ and $\rho = \rho_0 \in (0, R_{X_0})$, then it follows that for each $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, q\}$, $V_j \equiv |\text{graph } \rho_0 u_j(\rho_0^{-1}(\cdot))|$ is stationary with respect to the functional $\mathcal{F}(\cdot) = \mathcal{F}_{X_0}((\cdot) \llcorner \mathbf{R} \times B_{\sigma/2})$ where $\mathcal{F}_{X_0}$ is as in (18.1); thus, by computing the associated Euler-Lagrange equation and applying

elliptic regularity theory, we see that $u_j \in C^\infty(B_{\sigma/2})$ and satisfies an equation of the form

$$(18.6) \quad \sum_{k,\ell=1}^n a_{k\ell}^j D_k D_\ell u_j = f^j$$

on $B_{\sigma/2}$, with $|f^j(x)| \leq \mu\rho_0$ and $a_{k\ell}(x) = \delta_{k\ell} - \frac{D_k u_j(x) D_\ell u_j(x)}{\sqrt{1+|Du_j(x)|^2}} + b_{k\ell}^j(x)$, where $|b_{k\ell}^j(x)| \leq \mu\rho_0\sigma$, for $x \in B_{\sigma/2}$.

Theorem 18.3 (MINIMUM DISTANCE THEOREM—MANIFOLD VERSION). *Let $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$, $\rho_0 \in (0, \infty)$ and $\gamma \in (0, 1/2)$. Let $\alpha' = (2\alpha + 1)/4$. Suppose that $\mathbf{C}_0$ is an n -dimensional stationary cone in $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ such that $\text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}_0\|$ is equal to a finite union of at least three distinct n -dimensional half-hyperplanes of $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ meeting along an $(n-1)$ -dimensional subspace. Then there exists $\epsilon = \epsilon(\alpha, \gamma, \mu\rho_0, \mathbf{C}_0) \in (0, 1)$ such that if $V \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha^*(\rho_0)$, $\sigma \in (0, 1/2)$, $\Theta(\|V\|, 0) \geq \Theta(\|\mathbf{C}_0\|, 0)$ and $(\omega_n)^{-1}\|V\|(B_1^{n+1}(0)) \leq \Theta_{\mathbf{C}_0}(0) + \gamma$ then*

$$\sigma^{\alpha'} + \sigma^{-1} \text{dist}_{\mathcal{H}}(\text{spt } \|V\| \cap B_\sigma^{n+1}(0), \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}_0\| \cap B_\sigma^{n+1}(0)) \geq \epsilon.$$

The proof of Theorems 18.2 and 18.3 amounts to an easy modification of the induction argument given above for Theorems 3.2' and 3.3, which is the “Euclidean case,” viz. the case when $\mu = 0$ (which corresponds to the case when N is an open subset of $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ in Theorem 18.1). We outline the proof as follows:

(i) It follows from [SS81], Theorem 1, that Theorem 18.2 holds if V satisfies, in place of the structural condition $(\mathcal{S}\mathcal{J})$, that

$$\dim_{\mathcal{H}}(\text{sing } V) \leq n-7 \text{ in case } n \geq 7 \text{ and } \text{sing } V = \emptyset \text{ in case } n \leq 6,$$

together with all other hypotheses as in Theorem 18.2.

(ii) Let $\rho_0 \in (0, \infty)$ and let V be an integral n -varifold on $B_1^{n+1}(0)$ such that (18.2) holds with $\rho = \rho_0$ for some stationary integral n -varifold $\tilde{V}$ on N and $X \in \text{spt } \|\tilde{V}\|$ with $R_X \geq \rho_0$. Let $\sigma \in (0, 1)$, $\Lambda \in [1, \infty)$ and suppose that $(\omega_n \sigma^n)^{-1}\|V\|(B_\sigma^{n+1}(0)) \leq \Lambda$ and $\sigma^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_\sigma} |x^1|^2 d\|V\|(X) + \sigma < 1$. By taking $\psi(X) = x^1 \tilde{\zeta}^2(X) e^1$ in $(\mathcal{S}^* I)$, where $\tilde{\zeta} \in C_c^1(\mathbf{R} \times B_{3/4})$, we deduce that

$$(18.7) \quad \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_{3/4}} |\nabla x^1|^2 \tilde{\zeta}^2 d\|\eta_{0,\sigma} \# V\|(X) \leq C \left(\int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_{3/4}} |x^1|^2 |\nabla \tilde{\zeta}|^2 d\|\eta_{0,\sigma} \# V\|(X) + \sigma \right)$$

for each $\tilde{\zeta} \in C_c^1(\mathbf{R} \times B_{3/4})$ where $C = C(n, \Lambda, M, \mu\rho_0) \in (0, \infty)$, and $M = \sup_{\text{spt } \|\eta_{0,\sigma} \# V\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_{3/4})} |\tilde{\zeta}| + |D\tilde{\zeta}|$. Choosing $\tilde{\zeta}$ such that $\tilde{\zeta}(x^1, x') = \zeta(x')$ in a neighborhood of $\text{spt } \|\eta_{0,\sigma} \# V\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_{3/4})$, where $\zeta \in C_c^1(B_{3/4})$ is such that $\zeta \equiv 1$ on $B_{1/2}$, $0 \leq \zeta \leq 1$ and $|D\zeta| \leq 8$, we deduce from this that

$$(18.8) \quad \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_{1/2}} |\nabla x^1|^2 d\|\eta_{0,\sigma} \# V\|(X) \leq C \left(\int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_{3/4}} |x^1|^2 d\|\eta_{0,\sigma} \# V\|(X) + \sigma \right)$$

where $C = C(n, \Lambda, \mu\rho_0)$.

(iii) Let ρ_0, V be as in (ii) and let $\sigma \in (0, 3/4)$. With $\eta_{0,\sigma} \# V$ in place of V ,

$$\sqrt{\sigma^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_\sigma} |x^1|^2 d\|V\|(X) + \sigma}$$

in place of $\hat{E}_V$ and with the constants ϵ_0, C depending on $n, q, \mu\rho_0$, Theorem 5.1 holds; its proof amounts to modifying the argument of [Alm83], Theorem 3.8 in obvious ways, making use of (18.4), (18.5) and (18.8).

(iv) Consequently, the case $q = 1$ of Theorem 18.2 follows by the excess improvement argument as in [[All72], Chapter 8].

(v) From (iii) and the inequalities (18.5), (18.7), we deduce that for ρ_0, V as in (ii) and $\sigma \in (0, 3/4)$, Theorem 6.1 hold with $\eta_{0,\sigma} \# V$ in place of V and

$$\sqrt{\sigma^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_\sigma} |x^1|^2 d\|V\|(X) + \sigma}$$

in place of $\hat{E}_V$, again with the constants ϵ_1, C etc. depending also on $\mu\rho_0$.

(vi) For what follows, fix $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$, $\rho_0 \in (0, \infty)$, and let $\alpha' = (2\alpha + 1)/4$. For $V \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha^*(\rho_0)$ and $\sigma \in (0, 3/4)$ let

$$\hat{E}_{V_k}^*(\sigma) = \sqrt{\sigma^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_\sigma} |x^1|^2 d\|V\|(X) + \sigma^{2\alpha'}}.$$

Let q be an integer ≥ 2 , and assume inductively the validity of Theorem 18.2 with $1, 2, \dots, q-1$ in place of q and that of Theorem 18.3 if $\Theta(\|C_0\|, 0) \in \{3/2, 2, 5/2, \dots, q-1/2, q\}$.

(vii) For each $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$, let $\sigma_k \in (0, 3/4)$, $V_k \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha^*(\rho_0)$ be such that $\omega_n^{-1} \|V_k\|(B_1^{n+1}(0)) < q + 1/2$, $\sigma_k \rightarrow 0$ and $(q - 1/2) \leq (\omega_n \sigma_k^n)^{-1} \|V_k\|(B_{\sigma_k}^{n+1}(0)) < (q + 1/2)$. If $\hat{E}_{V_k}^*(\sigma_k) \rightarrow 0$, then as in the discussion following Theorem 5.1, we may blow up the sequence $\{\eta_{0,\sigma_k} \# V_k \llcorner B_1^{n+1}(0)\}$ by $\hat{E}_{V_k}^*(\sigma_k)$. We shall continue to call a function $v \in W_{\text{loc}}^{1,2}(B_1; \mathbf{R}^q) \cap L^2(B_1; \mathbf{R}^q)$ produced this way a coarse blow-up.

(viii) By the reasoning of Remarks 2, 3 of Section 7 and Step 1 above, we have the following:

Let q be an integer ≥ 2 and suppose that the induction hypotheses as in (vi) hold. If $V \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha^(\rho_0)$, $\Omega \subseteq B_1^{n+1}(0)$ is open and $\Theta(\|V\|, Z) < q$ for each $Z \in \text{spt } \|V\| \cap \Omega$, then $\mathcal{H}^{n-7+\gamma}(\text{sing } V \llcorner \Omega) = 0$ for each $\gamma > 0$ if $n \geq 7$ and $\text{sing } V \llcorner \Omega = \emptyset$ if $2 \leq n \leq 6$.*

(ix) The collection $\mathcal{B}_q^*$ of all coarse blow-ups v (as in (vii)) is a proper blow-up class, viz. $\mathcal{B}_q^*$ satisfies properties (B1)–(B7) of Section 4. Verification of properties (B1)–(B3), (B5) and (B6) proceeds in the same way as for the Euclidean case described in Section 8 above. In view of (i), property (B4) follows from the corresponding argument for the Euclidean case, also described in Section 8, with the inequality (18.5) taking the place of the monotonicity identity (6.1).

Property (B7) is verified by establishing separately the same two cases as in **Case 1** and **Case 2** of Section 9. With regard to **Case 1**, note that by taking $\psi(X) = \tilde{\zeta}(X)e^2$ in $(\mathcal{S}^*1)$, where $\tilde{\zeta} \in C_c^1(\mathbf{R} \times B_{3/4})$, it follows that for each $k = 1, 2, \dots$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_{3/4}} \nabla x^2 \cdot \nabla \tilde{\zeta} d\|\eta_{0,\sigma_k} \# V_k\|(X) \right| &\leq C \sup_{\text{spt } \|\eta_{0,\sigma_k} \# V_k\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_{3/4})} \left(|\tilde{\zeta}| + |D\tilde{\zeta}| \right) \sigma_k \\ &\leq C \sup_{\text{spt } \|\eta_{0,\sigma_k} \# V_k\| \cap (\mathbf{R} \times B_{3/4})} \left(|\tilde{\zeta}| + |D\tilde{\zeta}| \right) \sigma_k^{1-2\alpha'} \left(\hat{E}_{V_k}^*(\sigma_k) \right)^2 \end{aligned}$$

where $C = C(n, q, \mu\rho_0)$. **Case 1** is established by taking this in place of (9.8) and (18.7) in place of (5.1) in the argument of Lemma 9.1.

With regard to **Case 2**, we note that the following analogue of Lemma 13.1 holds. Here $\mathcal{C}_q, \mathcal{C}_q(p)$ are as defined in Section 10.

Lemma 18.4. *Let q be an integer ≥ 2 , $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$, $\theta \in (0, 1/4)$ and $\rho_0 \in (0, \infty)$. There exist numbers $\bar{\epsilon} = \bar{\epsilon}(n, q, \alpha, \theta, \mu\rho_0) \in (0, 1/2)$, $\bar{\gamma} = \bar{\gamma}(n, q, \alpha, \theta, \mu\rho_0) \in (0, 1/2)$ and $\bar{\beta} = \bar{\beta}(n, q, \alpha, \theta, \mu\rho_0) \in$*

$(0, 1/2]$ such that the following is true: Let $\sigma \in (0, 1)$ and suppose that the induction hypotheses as in (vi) and the following hold.

- (1) $V \in \mathcal{S}_\alpha^*(\rho_0)$, $\Theta(\|V\|, 0) \geq q$, $(\omega_n \sigma^n)^{-1} \|V\|(B_\sigma^{n+1}(0)) < q + 1/2$.
- (2) $\mathbf{C} = \sum_{j=1}^q |H_j| + |G_j| \in \mathcal{C}_q$, where for each $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, q\}$, H_j is the half-space defined by $H_j = \{(x^1, x^2, y) \in \mathbf{R}^{n+1} : x^2 < 0 \text{ and } x^1 = \lambda_j x^2\}$, G_j the half-space defined by $G_j = \{(x^1, x^2, y) \in \mathbf{R}^{n+1} : x^2 > 0 \text{ and } x^1 = \mu_j x^2\}$, with λ_j, μ_j constants, $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_q$ and $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2 \leq \dots \leq \mu_q$.
- (3) $\left(\hat{E}_V^*(\sigma)\right)^2 \equiv \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} |x^1|^2 d\|\eta_{0,\sigma} \# V\|(X) + \sigma^{2\alpha'} < \epsilon$, where $\alpha' = (2\alpha + 1)/4$.
- (4) $\{Z : \Theta(\|\eta_{0,\sigma} \# V\|, Z) \geq q\} \cap (\mathbf{R} \times (B_{1/2} \cap \{|x^2| < 1/16\})) = \emptyset$.
- (5)

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbf{R} \times (B_{1/2} \setminus \{|x^2| < 1/16\})} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\eta_{0,\sigma} \# V\|) d\|\mathbf{C}\|(X) \\ & \quad + \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}\|) d\|\eta_{0,\sigma} \# V\|(X) \leq \gamma \left(\hat{E}_V^*(\sigma)\right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

- (6) $\left(\hat{E}_V^*\right)^2 < \frac{3}{2} M_0 \inf_{\{P \in G_n : P \cap (\{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^n) = \{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^{n-1}\}} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, P), d\|V\|(X) + \sigma^{2\alpha'}$, where $M_0 = M_0(n, q) \in (1, \infty)$ is the constant defined in Section 10.
- (7) Either
 - (i) $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C}_q(4)$ or
 - (ii) $q \geq 3$, $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C}_q(p)$ for some $p \in \{5, \dots, 2q\}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbf{R} \times (B_{1/2} \setminus \{|x^2| < 1/16\})} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\eta_{0,\sigma} \# V\|) d\|\mathbf{C}\|(X) + \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}\|) d\|\eta_{0,\sigma} \# V\|(X) \\ & \leq \beta \inf_{\tilde{\mathbf{C}} \in \cup_{k=4}^{p-1} \mathcal{C}_q(k)} \left(\int_{\mathbf{R} \times (B_{1/2} \setminus \{|x^2| < 1/16\})} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\eta_{0,\sigma} \# V\|) d\|\tilde{\mathbf{C}}\|(X) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\tilde{\mathbf{C}}\|) d\|\eta_{0,\sigma} \# V\|(X) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then there exists an orthogonal rotation Γ of $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ and a cone $\mathbf{C}' \in \mathcal{C}_q$ such that the conclusions of Lemma 13.1 hold with $\eta_{0,\sigma} \# V$ in place of V , $\hat{E}_V^*(\sigma)$ in place of $\hat{E}$,

$$E_V^*(\mathbf{C}, \sigma) \equiv \sqrt{\int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}\|) d\|\eta_{0,\sigma} \# V\|(X) + \sigma^{2\alpha'}}$$

in place of E and with the constants $\bar{\kappa}$, $\bar{C}_0$, $\bar{\gamma}_0$, $\bar{\nu}$, $\bar{C}_1$, $\bar{C}_2 \in (0, \infty)$ depending only on n , q , α and $\mu\rho_0$.

In proving this, note first that if $\sigma^{2\alpha'} > \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} |x^1|^2 d\|\eta_{0,\sigma} \# V\|(X)$, then, provided $\gamma < \theta^{n+4}/2$, we trivially have that

$$\begin{aligned} \theta^{-n-2} \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_\theta} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}\|) d\|\eta_{0,\sigma} \# V\|(X) & \leq \theta^{-n-2} \gamma \left(\hat{E}_V^*(\sigma)\right)^2 \\ & \leq 2\theta^{-n-2} \gamma \sigma^{2\alpha'} \leq \theta^2 \sigma^{2\alpha'} \leq \theta^2 (E_V^*(\sigma))^2 \end{aligned}$$

and thus the conclusions (a)–(d) hold with $\mathbf{C}' = \mathbf{C}$ and $\Gamma = \text{Identity}$, and the conclusions (e) and (f) can be checked as in the proof of Lemma 13.1. Hence we may assume without loss of generality that $\left(\hat{E}_V^*(\sigma)\right)^2 \leq \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} |x^1|^2 d\|\eta_{0,\sigma} \# V\|(X)$. With this additional assumption and with the help

of inequality (18.5), the obvious analogues of Theorem 10.1 and Corollary 10.2 can be established; consequently, Lemma 18.4 can be proved by making obvious modifications to the entire argument leading to Lemma 13.1, as described in Sections 10–13.

The obvious analog of Lemma 13.3 then follows; note in particular that in the conclusions of this modified lemma we must take

$$Q_V^*(\mathbf{C}, \sigma) \equiv \left(\int_{\mathbf{R} \times (B_{1/2} \setminus \{|x^2| < 1/16\})} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\eta_{0,\sigma} \# \eta_{0,\sigma} \# V\|) d\|\mathbf{C}\|(X) + \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}\|) d\|\eta_{0,\sigma} \# V\|(X) + \sigma^{2\alpha'} \right)^{1/2}$$

in place of Q_V , and that the modified lemma yields that for some $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, 2q-3\}$, $\mathbf{C}' \in \mathcal{C}_q$ and some orthogonal rotation Γ of $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbf{R} \times (B_{1/2} \setminus \{|x^2| < 1/16\})} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\eta_{0,\theta_j\sigma} \# \eta_{0,\sigma} \# V\|) d\|\Gamma \# \mathbf{C}'\|(X) \\ & + \int_{\mathbf{R} \times B_1} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\Gamma \# \mathbf{C}'\|) d\|\eta_{0,\theta_j\sigma} \# V\|(X) \leq \nu_j \theta_j^2 (Q_V^*(\sigma))^2 \end{aligned}$$

where the parameters $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{2q-3}$ and the constants $\nu_1, \dots, \nu_{2q-3}$ are analogous to the same quantities as in Lemma 13.3, with ν_1 depending only on $n, q, \alpha, \mu\rho_0$ and for $j \in \{2, 3, \dots, 2q-3\}$, ν_j depending only on $n, q, \alpha, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_{j-1}, \mu\rho_0$. By choosing $\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_{2q-3}$ in that order, depending only on n, q, α and $\mu\rho_0$, to ensure that $\nu_j \theta_j^2 < \frac{1}{2} \theta_j^{2\alpha}$ and $\theta_j^{2\alpha'} < \frac{1}{2} \theta_j^{2\alpha}$ for each $j = 1, 2, \dots, 2q-3$, we deduce that under the hypotheses of the modified lemma,

$$(Q_V^*(\Gamma \# \mathbf{C}', \theta_j \sigma))^2 \leq \theta_j^{2\alpha} (Q_V^*(\mathbf{C}, \sigma))^2$$

for some $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, 2q-3\}$, $\mathbf{C}' \in \mathcal{C}_q$ and an orthogonal rotation Γ of $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$. In view of the Remark preceding Theorem 18.1, the iterative application of this as in Lemma 14.1 gives the analog of Lemma 14.1; arguing as in Corollary 14.2 then establishes **Case 2**, completing the proof that $\mathcal{B}_q^*$ is a proper blow-up class.

(x) In view of (i) and (18.6), the argument of Section 15 carries over to yield Theorem 18.2 for $q \geq 2$, subject to the induction hypotheses as in (vi). Theorem 18.3 when $\Theta(\|\mathbf{C}\|, 0) = q + 1/2$ and $\Theta(\mathbf{C}, 0) = q + 1$ then follow, again subject to the induction hypotheses as in (vi), from the argument, with obvious modifications, of Section 16; note in particular that in view of the “monotonicity inequality” (18.5) needed in the proof, and the need to use directly the first variation inequality ($\mathcal{S}^*1$) in establishing regularity of blow-ups as in Theorem 16.6, we must take

$$\mathcal{E}_V^*(\mathbf{C}, \sigma) \equiv \left(\int_{B_1^{n+1}(0)} \text{dist}^2(X, \text{spt } \|\mathbf{C}\|) d\|\eta_{0,\sigma} \# V\|(X) + \sigma^{2\alpha'} \right)^{1/2}$$

in place of the excess $\mathcal{E}$ used in Section 16 (see Lemma 16.7). Same modification applies to the excess $\mathcal{Q}$ used in Lemma 16.8.

Step 3: In view of **Step 1**, **Step 2** and the fact that Allard’s integral varifold compactness theorem ([All72], Theorem 6.4) holds in Riemannian manifolds, Theorem 18.1 follows from the argument of Theorem 3.1 in Section 17.

19. A VARIFOLD MAXIMUM PRINCIPLE

We conclude this paper by pointing out an immediate application of Theorem 18.1, namely, the following optimal strong maximum principle for co-dimension 1 stationary integral varifolds:

Theorem 19.1. *Let N be a smooth $(n+1)$ -dimensional Riemannian manifold.*

- (a) *If V_1, V_2 are stationary integral varifolds of N such that*

$$\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\text{spt } \|V_1\| \cap \text{spt } \|V_2\|) = 0,$$

then $\text{spt } \|V_1\| \cap \text{spt } \|V_2\| = \emptyset$.

- (b) *Let Ω_1, Ω_2 be open subsets of N with $\Omega_1 \subset \Omega_2$ and $M_i = \partial\Omega_i$, $i = 1, 2$. If for $i = 1, 2$, M_i is connected,*

$$\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\text{sing } M_i) = 0 \quad \text{and}$$

$|M_i|$ is stationary in N , then either

$$M_1 = M_2 \quad \text{or} \quad M_1 \cap M_2 = \emptyset.$$

Here $\text{sing } M_i = M_i \setminus \text{reg } M_i$, where $\text{reg } M_i$ is the set of points $X \in M_i$ with the property that there exists a number $\sigma = \sigma(X) > 0$ such that $M_i \cap B_\sigma^{n+1}(X)$ is a smooth, properly embedded hypersurface of $B_\sigma^{n+1}(X)$ with no boundary in $B_\sigma^{n+1}(X)$.

Remark: These results were established by T. Ilmanen ([Ilm96]) under the stronger hypotheses that

$$\mathcal{H}^{n-2}(\text{spt } \|V_1\| \cap \text{spt } \|V_2\|) = 0$$

in part (a) and

$$\mathcal{H}^{n-2}(\text{sing } M_i) = 0, \quad i = 1, 2,$$

in part (b). Obvious examples show that for any $\gamma > 0$, neither of these hypotheses can be weakened to $\mathcal{H}^{n-1+\gamma}(\cdot) = 0$.

Proof. The argument of [Ilm96] carries over, with (2) of [Ilm96] replaced by the hypothesis

$$\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\text{sing } M) = 0$$

and Theorems (8), (9) therein replaced by our Theorem 18.1. □

REFERENCES

- [All72] W. K. Allard. *On the first variation of a varifold*. Ann. of Math. **95** (1972), 417–491.
- [Alm83] F. J. Almgren, Jr. *Q-valued functions minimizing Dirichlet's integral and the regularity of area minimizing rectifiable currents up to codimension two*. Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.) **8** (1983), 327–328.
- [HS79] R. Hardt, L. Simon. *Boundary regularity and embedded solutions for the oriented Plateau problem*. Ann. of Math. **110** (1979), 436–486.
- [Ilm96] T. Ilmanen. *A strong maximum principle for singular minimal hypersurfaces*. Calc. Var. & PDE. **4** (1996), 443–467.
- [Mor66] C. B. Morrey, Jr. *Multiple Integrals in the Calculus of Variations*. Springer-Verlag, 1966.
- [Ros08] L. Rosales. Thesis, Stanford University (2008).
- [SS81] R. Schoen, L. Simon. *Regularity of stable minimal hypersurfaces*. Comm. Pure and Appl. Math. **34** (1981), 742–797.
- [SJ68] J. Simons. *Minimal varieties in Riemannian manifolds*. Ann. of Math. **88** (1968), 62–105.
- [Sim83] L. Simon. *Lectures on Geometric Measure Theory*. Proc. Centre Math. Anal., Austral. Nat. Univ., Canberra **3** (1983).
- [Sim93] ———. *Cylindrical tangent cones and the singular set of minimal submanifolds*. Journal of Differential Geometry **38** (1993), 585–652.
- [Sim96] ———. *Theorems on regularity and singularity of energy minimizing maps*. Birkhauser (1996).
- [SW07] L. Simon, N. Wickramasekera. *Stable branched minimal immersions with prescribed boundary*. Journal of Differential Geometry **75**, (2007), 143–173.
- [Wic04] N. Wickramasekera. *A rigidity theorem for stable minimal hypercones*. Journal of Differential Geometry **68**, no. 3, (2004), 433–514.